FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 062 *29 March 1984*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

PRAVDA Denies Contacts With U.S. on Arms AA 1
[Editorial Article 30 Mar]
Exposes U.S. 'Falsifications' AA 2
Zamyatin Urges Return to Helsinki Principles AA 2
[MOSCOW NEWS No 12]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

More on Moscow Meeting of CEMA Trade Commission BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]
CEMA Planning Body Session Opens in Budapest BB 1
[Budapest]
Company Independence Within CEMA Promoted [MTI] BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Libya Protests U.S. 'Harassment' in UN Forum CC 1
Libyan Minister Opens Debate CC 1
Syrian UN Delegate's Appeal CC 1
Paris UNESCO Fire; U.S. Propaganda Campaign CC 2
[Krasikov]
Trade Unions, European Security Session in Moscow CC 3
PRAVDA Reviews Arms Race, EEC Summit, Mideast CC 3
[Demchenko, 25 Mar]
PRAVDA's Zhukov Assesses Initial CDE Results [29 Mar] CC 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Bogachev: Reagan To Continue Arms Policies A 1
Space-Based Antimissile Defense 'Violation' [Kachanov] A 1
Pentagon 'Tentacles' Reaching for Space [Ponomarev] A 3
U.S. 'Slanders' USSR To Boost Arms Programs A 4
[Falin in IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]

CHINA

Chinese-Japanese Talks, Plans Assessed B 1
Ties' 'Special Nature' Seen B 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]
Economic Relations Extended B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Gromyko, Mongolian Foreign Minister Hold Talks C 1
[PRAVDA 29 Mar]
MPR Public Backs Government Stand on USSR Troops C 1
[Shpakov in PRAVDA 24 Mar]

Nakasone Admits Nuclear War Operation Plans C 2
[Golovnin]
Japan's 'Official' Anti-Sovietism Spurs Bad Ties C 3
[Kudryavtsev in IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]
U.S. 'Team-Spirit-84' 'Rimpac' Maneuvers Blasted C 6
[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]

SOUTH ASIA

Babrak Karmal Addresses DRA Tribal Elders D 1
DRA Blasts Iran's 'Anti-Afghan' Stance D 1
[ZA RUBEZHOM No 13]
Pakistan Said To Back U.S. Subversion of DRA D 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]
UK Article on Pakistan Coup Plot Scored D 2
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Mar]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Indonesian Foreign Minister on Coming USSR Visit E 1
[Sagaydak]
Briefs: USSR-PRK Friendship Agreement; E 1
SRV Cultural Delegation

WESTERN EUROPE

U.S.-Portuguese Space Tracking Station Agreement G 1
U.S. 'Financial Levers' G 1
SPD Youth Chairman on USSR Arms Talks Stand G 1
FRG's Vogel Interview on Arms, USSR-Ties G 2
[Markov in MOSCOW NEWS No 12]
FRG Support for U.S. Policies Excoriated G 3
[Grigoryants in IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]
Comparison of Kohl Report on Arms Talks Terms G 6
Zagladin Meets Austrian CP Leaders in Vienna G 6
UK Holds Tactical Exercises for Cruise Launches G 6
Bovin Analyzes Soviet-Swedish Relations G 7
[IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA

Atomic Energy Agreement Ratified With Syria H 1
U.S. Senate Votes Additional Funds for Israel H 1
Iran, Iraq Report Civilian Casualties H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Gromyko Welcomes Ethiopia's Mengistu in Moscow J 1
U.S. 'Provocative Steps' To Destabilize Region J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

USSR Navy Ships Continue Visit to Cuba K 1
Cuban Relations With Non-Communist World Viewed K 1
[Sobolev]
TASS Notes Nicaraguan Protest on Mine Incident K 2
Moscow Views U.S. Role in El Salvador Elections K 2
[Sobelev]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Council of Ministers Appointments Announced R 1
[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR No 6]
Antonov at Opening of Machine Tool Exhibition R 1
[PRAVDA 28 Mar]
Gazli Earthquake Aftermath, Recovery Reported R 1
Youth Paper Describes Scene R 1
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Mar]
Eyewitness Report R 2
[TRUD 25 Mar]
AUCCTU Conference Debates Work Shortcomings R 3
[TRUD 25 Mar]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Examination of New Brigade Method of Work S 1
[Voznesenskiy]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agro-Industrial Conference Proceedings 27 Mar T 1
[PRAVDA 28 Mar]
TASS Provides Data on USSR 'Food Problem' T 3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

USSR-India Joint Launch To Begin 3 Apr U 1
Briefs: Turkmen Water Resources U 1

PRAVDA DENIES CONTACTS WITH U.S. ON ARMS

PM291733 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Washington Misinformers"]

[Text] Having gone ahead with the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe late last year, thus thwarting the Geneva talks on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons, Washington at first tried to create the impression that nothing much had happened. One self-assured statement followed another to the effect that the Soviet Union would return to the negotiating table tomorrow if not today.

Gentlemen in Washington and certain other NATO capitals would like very much to take cover behind a front of talks as they were developing in Western Europe a new nuclear-missile force aimed against the USSR and its allies.

But that trick flopped. Hypocritical appeals for the resumption of the talks went amiss as the Soviet leadership firmly stated that the USSR was not going to participate in the talks the purpose of which was to deceive the peoples.

It was stated likewise definitively at the same time that if the USA and other NATO countries displayed readiness to return to the situation which had existed before the deployment of the U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union would also be ready to do so. In other words, the Geneva talks could be resumed only in that case.

Having come against that principled stand of the Soviet Union, Washington realized that it had ridiculed itself with its predictions of the early resumption of the Geneva talks.

However, it did not make a conclusion in favor of doing business honestly. This is not the habit of the incumbent U.S. Administration. When one deceitful ploy failed, it decided to resort to another one -- more sophisticated, as they in Washington thought.

All sorts of rumours began to float from Washington at some point that although there were no official talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments, there was no reason for worry either as those matters presumably continued to be "discussed" between Washington and Moscow.

They are whispering this tale into the ears of their West European allies. They are thickening fog over trips of various U.S. figures to Moscow non-governmental channels. They even speculate on these themes over regular meetings of the Soviet and U.S. ambassadors to Washington and Moscow, respectively, with officials of the host countries.

Spokesmen for the U.S. Department of State confirm during their meetings with journalists that U.S. missiles continue to be deployed in Western Europe but at the same time add meaningfully that Soviet-U.S. dialogue on these questions "also continues".

In the hope of reducing the pitch of their struggle against the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe.

But the latest invention of Washington's master misinformers should not dupe anyone. There is not a grain of truth in the allegations about "unofficial contacts" with the USSR on those matters which were discussed in Geneva earlier.

Exposes U.S. 'Falsifications'

LD282121 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] The Soviet daily PRAVDA has published an article exposing the falsification circulated by Washington about the Geneva talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons. The capital of the United States, the paper says, circulates rumors about unofficial contacts with the Soviet Union on issues earlier discussed in Geneva. It's obscuring the issue of trips to Moscow by various American figures along nongovernmental lines. It's ascribing special meaning to ordinary meetings of Soviet and American ambassadors with officials in the countries where they are staying.

Spokesman for the State Department are telling newsmen that the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States on issues related to the deployment of American missiles in Europe allegedly continues.

There is not a bit of truth in all this, the Soviet paper says.

The Soviet leadership has firmly stated that the Soviet Union does not intend to participate in talks which the United States used as a smokescreen for building a new nuclear missile strike force in Western Europe. Simultaneously it definitely announced that if the United States and other NATO countries display a readiness to return to the situation that prevailed before the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Europe began the Soviet Union would be ready to do so too.

In other words, the old talks in Geneva could be resumed only in this case.

Misinformers in Washington, PRAVDA says, are trying to mislead the public in the hope of reducing the struggle against the deployment of American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe.

ZAMYATIN URGES RETURN TO HELSINKI PRINCIPLES

PM290908 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 12, 25 Mar 84 p 5

[Leonid Zamyatin article: "East-West Relations: Lessons and Prospects"]

[Text] The international situation has acquired a character which is causing concern in parliaments, governments, international organizations and among the public. We are concerned about the events in Lebanon in the Strait of Hormuz, and in Central America where one of the great powers is denying small countries their right to develop along the path they have chosen for themselves. Nor can we remain indifferent to the destiny of our continent -- Europe.

Only a few years ago did it seem that Europe's future could be considered safe. There was a beginning to detente which started to gain in strength. A productive political dialogue got under way. Economic scientific, technical and cultural cooperation broadened with every passing year. Hopeful signs of transition to military detente appeared. And now all of this has been called in question after NATO's well-known decision of December 12, 1979. If it has so far been possible to preserve peace in Europe for nearly forty years then this was, to a great extent, a result of the existing approximate balance of military forces.

Parity is the backbone of European security and stability. And now it is being threatened. To one extent or another the consequences of the ill-famed decision that disrupted the peaceful rhythm of Europe has affected all Europeans.

The main thing is that not a single country and not a single people, be it in the East or West, has gained either greater security or greater stability.

We in the Soviet Union have done all we could to prevent the present derangement of East-West relations. It is not our fault that this has proved impossible to do.

Today attempts are being made in the West to make people believe that it depends solely on the USSR whether the interrupted dialogue be resumed. But a political dialogue becomes meaningless if it is conducted from a position of strength, striving to put the other partner at a disadvantage and endanger his legitimate interests, primarily those of security.

We conducted a dialogue in Geneva on limiting nuclear arms in Europe for nearly two years, hoping up to the very last day to find a mutually acceptable solution. We put forward one proposal after another, striving for a compromise. We went as far as proposing unilateral measures to help reach an agreement. And what line did our partner pursue? He developed at full speed preparations for deploying missiles, rejecting the alternatives offered to him and not making proposals, which could be in any way acceptable to the other side. What was proposed were only projects of unilateral disarmament to be carried out by the USSR.

Is a dialogue productive when people use hollow words at the negotiating table and then behind the walls of the conference hall implement a programme of complementary armament? This dialogue, if it can be called so, will do no good to the international community. We are for a real dialogue -- equitable and constructive.

Quite a few themes for a constructive political dialogue between the East and West have piled up. So that this dialogue should be meaningful, so that it should be full of life and finally contribute to a change for the better in the international situation and prevent another war, the Soviet Union and its allies have submitted a number of views and ideas to be considered by the Western countries and the international community as a whole. Here are the most important initiatives.

We suggest that all nuclear powers assumed an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as the Soviet Union has already done unilaterally.

Together with the other socialist countries, we suggest that a treaty be concluded on the mutual non-use of military force and on maintaining peaceful relations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO states.

Implementing these proposals would beyond all doubt help dispel mutual mistrust and contribute to improving the present criticial situation. What do we hear in reply? Only lame excuses like, for example, the point about the non-use of force being recorded in the UN Charter and other documents. This, incidentally, does not by any means prevent some states from using force in the Middle East and Central America. What we propose is not duplicating the provisions of the UN Charter, but concluding a document which has a binding force on the renunciation of the use of both nuclear and conventional arms and of military force in general.

We favour taking a simple and at the same time effective step, that of freezing weapons on a global scale, moreover, only in the USSR and the USA to start with. This measure suggests itself; it would not require long consultations if, of course, there is good will and readiness to halt the avalanche of nuclear arms.

We have put forward specific proposals on how to avert the threat of the use of force from space and in space, and suggest that we should begin discussing this problem without delay, as it is fraught with the risk of ushering into the world a truly "fantastic era" of the arms race and "star wars".

A proposal was put forward to completely eliminate chemical weapons, including one of freeing Europe from chemical weapons.

A detailed draft agreement on mutually reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe has been lying on the table of the Vienna talks for a year already and has not received a reply.

On the table of the Stockholm conference there is a Soviet-proposed package of large-scale and not only narrow-technical confidence-building measures.

I could go on. We do not regard our proposals as the ultimate truth. We are ready to examine other considerations and counter-proposals -- if only there were a readiness to look for a way of solving the outstanding problems. If only there were a readiness to do what the whole international community expects most of all from the states: that is to get down to real measures for real disarmament. Recently I spoke at the Rome Institute of International Problems and I recalled that as early as in the 1920s at the international conference in Genoa the Soviet Union proposed the first programme in the history of mankind on universal reduction of armaments. Since then our country has remained a convinced champion of general and complete disarmament and of any specific measures leading towards this goal.

Regrettably, we have hardly met any reciprocity on this path. Some of our proposals have been rejected, as I have already said, by far-fetched excuses, others have been hampered, and still others are left unanswered. How is one to carry out a dialogue in this case? But in the meantime the arms race is accelerating its already sinister pace. Is it not time to stop it? Is it not time to do our best so that detente should again set the tone in international relations?

Of course, in many respects this depends on the USSR and the USA. We understand the concern about the worsening in Soviet-American relations. We are ourselves concerned with this, being aware of the significance of these relations for the people of both countries, for normalizing the situation in the world, and for improving relations in the East-West sphere. We are not looking for confrontation with the USA. We are looking for a productive political dialogue, a dialogue which would be focused on the fundamental issues of war and peace, on establishing a level of relations which would be consistent with the requirements of both countries and the vital interests of the world community.

Not everything, however, depends entirely on us. On the other hand, regrettably, we have not been offered anything specific. So far there is no desire to go from words to deeds. But general calls for improving relations alone and what is known as "warming up the tone" is not enough.

There are people in Europe who, deliberating on the need to improve Soviet-American relations, would like to use this as a screen for their own inaction. However, the situation is such that it requires a peaceful contribution, effort and initiative from each state. The Soviet Union, as K.U. Chernenko emphasized, will cooperate to the utmost with every state which is prepared by practical deeds to help lessen the international tension and build an atmosphere of confidence in the world.

We believe in following the path of cooperation which has been tested by time and borne out by history.

Looking back on the USSR's relations with particular West European countries in the post-war period, I think I will not be going against the truth if I were to say that they have reached their utmost development in every sphere (political, trade, economic and cultural) during the period of the warming up of the international political climate, during the period of detente. These years were keynoted by lively political contacts, mutually advantageous and in many respects innovatory trade and economic relations, and intensive cultural exchanges. For instance, the Soviet-Italian trade and economic deals were called "deals of the century", while cultural relations were officially characterized as a model of interstate relations.

We favour cooperation wtih countries like Italy to be further developed. The possibilities for this exist, we believe. But I will not hide the fact that the prospects are darkened by such an aggravating factor as the nuclear-missile "rearmament" of NATO. We are told today that there is a need for some "new principle" in East-West relations. It is not very clear what is meant by this. Is it not that detente no longer suits anyone? We believe, nevertheless, that it would be better for all not to slide into the rut of confrontation, but to go along the justified route which was designated in the Hensinki Final Act and which has the signatures of every European country, and also those of the USA and Canada.

Unfortunately, it has to be stated that the policy of the USA and some other NATO countries has chosen different guideposts.

Our proposals for reducing the nuclear-missile confrontation in Europe fully retain their force. We are for a safe Europe, a Europe without nuclear arms -- both medium-range and tactical. It is necessary to listen to the voice of reason and stop eroding European and world peace by building up arms. Stop breaking up the military-strategic parity and chasing after the unattainable: i.e. military superiority.

It must be stated clearly that the existence of Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe, which was the reason for the breakdown of the Geneva talks, is also a serious obstacle today to resuming a dialogue on nuclear arms. That is exactly why we call on the USA to return to the original position, that is, to the time when there were no medium-range American missiles in Europe. In this case our countermeasures will be cancelled. And then the prospect will be opened for a dialogue on these weapons.

During a meeting with Hans-Jochen Vogel, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany faction in the Bundestag, Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said: "We underline the necessity to return to the previous position not because of considerations of prestige, we simply do not want the danger of war to continue to grow in Europe and the whole world. In other words, we proceed from our desire to strengthen peace."

We believe that in the final analysis the international community will be able to achieve by a common effort a healthy change for the better in developing international events. We do not consider that the East and West are doomed to total confrontation and, the more so, to something even worse. To achieve a change for the better, general declarations and wishes of "warming up the tone" alone are not enough. There is a need, above all, for specific deeds, productive decisions, and joint action by the states in the East and West.

The Soviet Union is ready for this.

MORE ON MOSCOW MEETING OF CEMA TRADE COMMISSION

PM281351 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Development of Cooperation"]

[Text] A routine session of CEMA's Permanent Commission on Foreign Trade was held in Moscow 20-22 March.

Taking part in the commission's session were delegations from the CEMA member countries and the SFRY.

The session examined and approved a report on the commission's work in 1983 and the future directions in its work stemming from the tasks set by the 37th sitting of the CEMA Council session and its Executive Committee. It was noted that last year the economy and foreign trade of CEMA member countries underwent further substantial development. As before, reciprocal trade played an active role in the fulfillment of plans for their economic development and the further development of their national economies. Foreign trade developed systematically on the basis of long-term trade agreements and annual protocols.

The pledges concerning reciprocal goods deliveries under agreements forming part of the coordinated plan for multilateral integration measures between CEMA member countries in 1981-1985 are being successfully implemented.

Trade between CEMA member countries and the SFRY continued to develop.

Other questions were also discussed.

The resolutions adopted by the commission are aimed at further developing cooperation between CEMA member countries in the foreign trade sphere as well as at safeguarding the interests of the socialist community countries under conditions where imperialist circles are following a course of further exacerbating the international situation and undermining normal international political and economic relations.

Emphasis was placed on the line consistently followed by the CEMA countries of developing trade and economic relations with all states which are prepared to cooperate on an equal and mutually advantageous basis regardless of economic development levels or socio-economic systems.

The commission's session took place in an atmosphere of comradely cooperation and mutual understanding.

CEMA PLANNING BODY SESSION OPENS IN BUDAPEST

LD270901 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0800 GMT 27 Mar 84

[Text] Prime Minister Gyorgy Lazar has opened the Budapest session of the CEMA Planning Cooperation Committee. The head of government spoke highly of the important role of plan coordination, which is being realized with the framework of the organization, in laying the foundation for the economic development of the member states. Delegates at the consultation will debate planning work for the period 1986-90. Member countries are represented at the session by chairmen of central planning organs.

COMPANY INDEPENDENCE WITHIN CEMA PROMCTED

LD271115 Budapest MTI in English 1024 GMT 27 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow, March 27 (MTI) -- Academician Oleg Bogomolov, manager of the Economic Institute of the Socialist World System, has given a statement to MTI on the development of the Soviet economic mechanism.

Bogomolov said that the intention to consolidate central direction and simultaneously increase company independence and efficiency is a decisive element of current economic experiments in the Soviet Union.

Much attention is paid in the Soviet Union to the management of scientific-technical progress in the socialist countries, where -- e.g. in Hungary, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic -- there are a number of examples for the enhancement of company independence. Although there are differences in attitudes to the relationship of centralization and economic independence, common features in improving economic management systems provide a sufficient basis for successful economic cooperation in the CMEA.

Bogomolov recalled the stand of the CPSU 26th Congress on the establishment of direct company relations among socialist countries. "The development of CEMA cooperation today also requires the exploration of company reserves, in addition to central plan coordination. Companies, therefore, should be enabled to have direct talks on cooperation. Our present experiment is aimed at preparing a decision on the shaping of direct company relations."

LIBYA PROTESTS U.S. 'HARASSMENT' IN UN FORUM

Libyan Minister Opens Debate

LD282219 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] New York March 28 TASS -- 'Ali A. at-Turayki, foreign minister of Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, stated today (Wednesday) an "explosive and dangerous" situation that existed in Libya's area was due to "American provocations and harassment against this small country". In opening a Security Council's debate on a complaint of Libya, he warned that could lead to a situation that would threaten international peace and security.

He pointed out that ever since the revolution in Libya, the United States had conducted military provocations against Libya, instituted an economic blockade and conducted a slander campaign against Libya. The sending to the Sudan of AWAC planes by the United States was another provocation against Libya. Libya was supposed to be a "threat" to Egypt and the Sudan. Yet, the population of Libya was 3 million and the population of Egypt and the Sudan was 70 million.

How could Libya be a threat to those countries? -- 'Ali A. at-Turayki asked.

The foreign minister of Libya recalled that in past months the Security Council had met to consider American aggression against Libya, the American invasion and occupation of Grenada, and continuous American harassment of Nicaragua. The United States had supported Somoza in Nicaragua and the shah in Iran, he stated. But they had not been considered "terrorists" by the United States. They had been friends of the United States. "Libya doesn't want to be a Somoza or a shah. My country doesn't want to have American military bases on its soil", he added.

Syrian UN Delegate's Appeal

LD282251 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] New York March 28 TASS -- Permanent representative of Syria to the United Nations Di Ya'allah al-Fattah, appealed today to the Security Council to end the "policy of force, intimidation and the threat of the use of force pursued by the United States". Speaking in a council's debate on a complaint of Libya he expressed grave concern at the U.S. threats to that country. "Those threats are evidenced by American military movements in the region. It is yet one more link in the chain of American provocations in Asia, Africa and Central America", he pointed out.

Syrian delegate said the United States was pursuing its political goals "by force of arms." The strengthening of the United States Rapid Deployment Force and the dispatch of AWAC planes to the region had come in the wake of the failure of the American-Israeli alliance to impose on Lebanon the agreement of May 1983, he stated.

The United States was seeking to consolidate its military presence in the region, and its pretexts were only intended for that purpose, he said.

The United States acted as though there were no legitimate national interests on the face of the earth "except those that acquiesced to American hegemony". Virtually American imperialist interests were in "basic contradiction" to the interests of the Third World, he said.

The United States was trying to deepen the division of the Arab homeland, and trying to play one Arab country against another. But if United States Secretary of State George Shultz thought he could provoke an Arab-Arab war, and thereby divert the Arab nation from the liberation of Palestine, he was wrong. Diya'allah al-Fattah said the United States was ignoring the political reality that the Arabs would never become a base for United States hegemony in the region, he concluded.

PARIS UNESCO FIRE; U.S. PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

LD290624 Moscow TASS in English 0609 GMT 29 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov reports: The Soviet public has been deeply alarmed by the news of a blaze in the headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Paris. It is pointed out that the flames broke out simultaneously in different parts of the building and that the fire caused serious material damage. Many documents were destroyed, and the building itself was damaged.

The mass media reported that the French police, whose representatives inspected the site, do not have any doubt that what happened was a crime.

Who put the UNESCO building on fire and who stood behind the arsonists' backs? Today the public does not yet have enough data to answer these questions with full certainty. But it is known to the whole world where incessant threats against UNESCO are coming from and who does not like its activities directed at bringing the nations closer together and promoting broad coopration among states, irrespective of their social systems.

The vicious propaganda campaign against UNESCO has long been waged in the United States. When reading some papers, UNESCO Deputy Director-General Henri Lopes said in a comment on this campaign, one was apt to think involuntarily, that the authors of the gross slanders floated by them were stubbornly following the recommendations given in his time by Goebbels, chief of the propaganda mills of Nazi Germany, who had liked to repeat: "Lie, lie and lie - and something will stick".

The diatribes against UNESCO have been especially shrill after the U.S. Government announced its intention to quit this organization from January 1, 1985, "if it does not modify its conduct" to please Mr. Reagan.

The United States would not like, for instance, to see the UNESCO rostrum used by those who stress that the development of education, science and culture loses its meaning when it is war preparations that take priority. Washington also demands that UNESCO give up its efforts in favour of establishing a new international economic and information order and not say a word in the face of attempts to force newly-free developing nations into adopting an alien way of life and deprive them of their cultural identity. Finally, if one is to believe American press reports, the U.S. President feels personal enmity towards the UNESCO director-general, Senegalese Amadou Mahtar M'bow, and so, it is reasoned in Washington, another person should be appointed to head the organization.

American blackmail, however, has not produced the desired effect. None of the other 160 UNESCO member states have so far followed the U.S. example. The organization's leadership has reminded the insolent blackmailers that it is not following any "personal policy" but is only fulfilling the resolutions of the UNESCO general conferences which, as a rule, are passed unanimously.

After the blaze M'bow met with the UNESCO staff and called on them to maintain self-control to be able to help the member states pursue international cooperation. He reaffirmed that he would continue performing the duties entrusted to him (unanimously again) by the countries participation in the organization. The UNESCO staff, on their part, declared their solidarity with the director-general.

As to the Soviet Union, it is, like the overwhelming majority of the UNESCO members, convinced that this organization will fulfill the task, formulated in Article 1 of its charter, of facilitating the strengthening of peace and security and promoting international cooperation through education, science and culture.

TRADE UNIONS, EUROPEAN SECURITY SESSION IN MOSCOW

LD290848 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 29 Mar 84

[Text] An international meeting of the trade unions and European security has opened here in Moscow. Delegates of 16 socialist and capitalist countries are taking part. They will discuss concerted action by the trade unions for the strengthening of security and the development of cooperation on the European Continent.

PRAVDA REVIEWS ARMS RACE, EEC SUMMIT, MIDEAST

PM281025 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[Pavel Demchenko "International Review"]

[Text] Acute Confrontation

If we are to pick out the main issues from the abundant stream of reports on events in international life, the prime issues are those of war and peace and people's concern about how to halt the ever-quickening arms race and to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe which is hanging over mankind.

Naturally, the question of how the international situation will take shape now and in the foreseeable future depends to a considerable extent on the policy of the nuclear powers, especially the USSR and the United States, and on the relations prevailing between them. These relations have recently deteriorated sharply through the fault of Washington, and this has made an appreciable mark on the entire international atmosphere.

In the past week there have been a number of events confirming this regrettable truth. The report of one such event came from far-off Nicaragua. On 20 March the Soviet tanker Lugansk was damaged after striking a mine while approaching Puerto Sandino. Several seamen were injured.

It must be said that this is by no means the first such incident off the Latin American country's shores. In early March two fishing vessels, the Dutch dry-cargo ship Geopotes and the Panamanian ship (Nort Karibe) were blown up there. As the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry has stated, the mines were laid by mercenaries in the service of the U.S. Administration. Clearly, this can only be described as brigandage and piracy in international sea lanes.

The Soviet Government protested resolutely to the United States in connection with the criminal act against our tanker and warned Washington that it will bear full responsibility for the consequences with which the continuation of actions of this kind are fraught.

Central America is not the only region where the United States is interfering in the affairs of other countries and peoples, engaging in saber-rattling, and fueling tension. This also applies to the eastern Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, West Europe, and the Far East.

This course is causing acute alarm among the peace-loving public everywhere. This is reflected in the course of the election campaign now under way in the United States itself. Thus the Democratic Party's contenders for the Presidency are trying to dissociate themselves from the present administration's militarist goals and are speaking of the need to freeze nuclear arms and to mend relations with the Soviet Union.

Something that attracts attention in this respect is an article by the diplomat and scientist Marshall Shulman, who held a number of responsible posts in previous U.S. Administrations. He writes that he is astonished most of all by the current U.S. leadership's primitive ideas about the USSR. This simplistic and distorted approach leads to simplistic policy which prevents the maintenance of rational relations with the Soviet Union. This applies in particular to the myth that Washington is pushing about the USSR's imaginary "aggressiveness." "The Soviet Union does not desire war," Shulman writes. "No one who has seen how alive the memory of the sacrifices made in World War II is in that country and how universal the awareness of the consequences of nuclear war is over there -- which cannot be said of the United States -- can doubt that."

Recent speeches by White House representatives have invariably included passages about a desire to strengthen peace. These words, however, have not been backed up by real deeds, either regionally or globally. Washington and the West as a whole have still not replied, for example, to the Soviet proposals aimed at making it possible to begin without delay to solve specific problems such as freezing Europe from nuclear weapons, freezing nuclear arsenals, preventing the militarization of space, and ridding the planet of chemical weapons or the proposal on subordinating relations between nuclear powers to certain norms whose recognition and implementation would meet mankind's vital interests.

However, despite all the complexity of the present international situation (and recent events confirm this), it should not be dramatized. As K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has noted, "the roots of detente are deep." This is demonstrated both by the powerful antiwar movement in many countries, including the NATO countries, and by the desire of Western business circles to develop trade and economic, cultural, and other cooperation with the socialist community. Nor are efforts ceasing on the diplomatic level. Thus a conference of experts from 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada has begun in the Greek capital. The agenda includes the formulation of a generally acceptable method for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Assessing the present situation in the world, the Hungarian newspaper NEPSZABADSAG has written: "Broad opportunities exist for the U.S. Administration to back up its peace-loving noises with concrete deeds. This could lead to the beginning of a real breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations and in international politics as a whole. The ball is now in the U.S. court. One thing is absolutely certain -- the Soviet Union will not slacken its efforts to ensure peace and the peoples' security."

Yet Another Failure

Surely no meeting of the "Common Market" leaders has been held in an atmosphere of such pessimism as the one held this week in Brussels. Even on the eve of the present conference of leaders of the states and governments of the "Ten," the West's newspapers were unusually unanimous in their gloomy predictions, and on this occasion these were completely borne out. After 2 days of meetings, French President F. Mitterrand, who was in the chair in Brussels, was compelled to describe the situation in the EEC as "extremely serious."

The participants in the meeting tried to agree on major questions of joint agricultural and budget policy. However, they could not reach agreement on any of them. As with last year's session in Athens, no final communique or statement was adopted. They even had to refrain from issuing a declaration of a political character. In brief, the meeting ended in utter confusion and deadlock.

Thus Prime Minister M. Thatcher demanded an approximately fourfold reduction in Britain's contribution of 1.2 billion pounds to the EEC budget and the refund of the difference for a few years, stating that she does not wish to finance countries with more backward agriculture. Some participants in the meeting assert that it was the British prime minister's intransigence which stopped them from reaching agreement. But that is not the whole issue, of course. The causes of the disagreements go much deeper.

Suffice it to say that Irish Prime Minister G. Fitzgerald ostentatiously left the conference before the end. And when F. Mitterrand tried to overcome the deadlock by proposing a compromise resolution, it was rejected not only by the British delegation but also by the Italian and Danish delegations.

The situation that the Common Market finds itself in reflects the general crisis which now grips the whole capitalist system. Unemployment in the EEC countries alone is now almost 13 million, the living standards of many strata of the population are falling, and industry is at a standstill yet military spending in the NATO countries is increasing year by year. Furthermore, the contradictions at the present stage are being intensified to a considerable extent because of pressure from the United States, which is pushing Western Europe into a militarist course, thereby burdening its economy with additional military programs, which inevitably leads to an aggravation of social problems. As experience shows, the big corporations are getting rich on this policy while all the burdens fall on the shoulders of working people.

And it is no coincidence that the Parisian newspaper L'HUMANITE noted that the Brussels meeting was unable to provide any answer to the problems from which the peoples are actually suffering. Without waiting for the meeting's decisions, French peasants organized mass demonstrations against the Common Market's agricultural policy in France's main agricultural regions. Peasants held similar demonstrations in Belgium too. The "Common Market" has demonstrated once again that it is seriously ill, like capitalism as a whole.

"Trouble Spots"

Throughout last week, as, indeed, for many weeks before, there was no letup in the stream of alarming reports from the Near East, a region which has been a center of the most acute tension for a third of a century now. These events are noteworthy not only for their tragic nature but also because their significance goes far beyond the local framework of limited zones and acquires a dangerous international character.

Suffice it to say, for instance, that U.S. Armed Forces are stationed in different parts of the region and that the NATO allies' forces are also located in a number of places. The U.S. Marines have been forced to withdraw from Lebanon's territory, as have the British, Italians, and French along with them, but one detachment of warships of the U.S. 6th Fleet remains off the country's shores while another is moving closer to Libya, which Washington is accusing of interference in Sudanese affairs. Large U.S. naval forces are now concentrated near the entrance to the Persian Gulf allegedly to protect shipping through the Strait of Hormuz if Iran tries to close it. Reports have appeared in the Western press that those forces may be joined by a French squadron. Some observers believe that the question of U.S.-French military cooperation in the Near East was in the forefront at Mitterrand's recent talks with President Reagan in Washington.

It is not just talk when people say that wherever a center of tension or what appears to be purely internecine strife flares up, the hand of imperialism and the signs of foreign interference are always visible. Reactionaries, whatever country they operate in, seek and find support in the West. Foreign and above all U.S. agents exploit disagreements among the developing countries and internal discord and often reopen old wounds by reviving past conflicts in order to turn them to their own advantage and strengthen their military and political positions in a particular region. The example of the Near East is very instructive in this respect.

It is no wonder that the patriotic forces of the countries in this region are striving to eliminate foreign interference. The departure of the so-called multinational forces from Lebanon provided an opportunity initially to annul the inequitable Lebanese-Israeli agreement imposed by Washington and then to resume the national reconciliation conference held in Lausanne. The first step has been taken there toward normalizing the situation in the country.

This is no easy matter, since the internal conflict in Lebanon arose long ago. It reflected primarily the archaic nature of the political structure, which aggravated social inequality. From the moment of the proclamation of Lebanon's independence the parliament, government, and other organs of power in the country have been formed on a religious principle, according to the approximate size of the communities as they were in 1943. It was calculated that at the time the Christians, and in particular the Maronite Catholics, outnumbered the Muslims. Since then the size of the Muslim and specifically the Shi'ite and Druze communities has increased but their representation in the organs of power has remained unchanged. Those who have the advantages do not want to give them up. A whole series of economic and social problems arose, and these have now been discussed in Lausanne. It was decided first of all to restore security in the country and to create a constitutional commission which is to draft the future reforms within 6 months.

For Lebanon, with its long-standing and bloody contradictions, this task in itself is not simple. Furthermore, it is complicated by the continuing Israeli occupation of the southern part of the country, which the aggressor, relying on U.S. support, has absolutely no intention of leaving. Nor, by all accounts, has Washington any intention of accepting its defeats in Lebanon or of refraining from interfering in the latter's affairs. Thus the path to the full normalization of the situation in Lebanon remains difficult.

As for the brutal Iran-Iraq war, which is now in its 4th year, as yet it has not been possible even to begin peaceful dialogue here. Furthermore the fighting, which is now taking place on Iraqi territory, in particular near the city of Basrah, has become much fiercer in recent days. For all the contradictoriness of the reports from the front, it is possible to conclude that the largest forces since the start of the conflict are now taking part in the fighting. The two sides' air forces are bombing heavily populated cities. Losses are numbered in thousands, confirming once again the bitter truth that the two neighboring countries are continuing to weaken and bleed each other dry in what is essentially a fratricidal war.

The international public is alarmed. Once attempt after another is being made to end the bloodshed. An extraordinary conference of Arab states' foreign ministers has just issued an appeal to that end. The Algerian Government has stated that it is ready to resume its mediation efforts. Iraq has expressed agreement to begin the search for peace. Iran, for its part, is putting forward political conditions which make it impossible to begin the peace process. Nor has Tehran responded to the relevant UN appeal, even though a rational solution can be found only at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield.

As is well known, the Soviet Union advocates this very path. It supports the speediest settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict. It is striving to secure the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon, and indeed from all the other Arab lands occupied since 1967, and the establishment of a just peace throughout the Near East. The USSR resolutely opposes imperialist interference in the affairs of the countries of both this and other regions of the world, upholding the cause of peace and the independence of the peoples.

PRAVDA'S ZHUKOV ASSESSES INITIAL CDE RESULTS

PM290953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov: "Who Is Promoting Confidence and Who Is Hampering It?" -- Capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] Wide circles of the international public are discussing the results of the first round of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, convened by decision of the Madrid meeting of representatives of the governments of the European states, the United States, and Canada, which lasted from 17 January through 16 March. As is well known, the decision to hold this conference was adopted as a result of a prolonged, stubborn struggle by the USSR, the other socialist countries, and all peace-loving forces against the negative stance of the United States and its main NATO allies.

The significance of this decision was noted in the election speech by Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who stated that the convocation of the Stockholm conference indicates how deep detente's roots are. However hard the forces of war and reaction try to undermine detente and substitute a policy of confrontation, it lives on.

The Long Road to Cooperation

Many years were needed to establish the all-European process of the development of security and cooperation. The road to this development was opened up by the proposals of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries back in 1966, but for a long time the United States and its allies refused to accept those proposals.

It was only in the early seventies, under pressure from public opinion, that the constructive dialogue for which the socialist countries were calling began. It was launched within the framework of the all-European conference. As a result of prolonged discussions, the socialist countries' proposals aimed at strengthening peace and security in Europe became the basis for the conference's Final Act, signed in Helsinki in 1975 by the heads of 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada. This document, which is of unfading historical significance, laid the foundations for the all-European process of strengthening security and developing cooperation.

The USSR then called for the materialization of detente to be embarked on without wasting time. And although that appeal did not meet with a positive response in Washington, and the then U.S. President Ford stated that he would not even utter the word "detente," the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, supported by all sensible people in Europe, continued their efforts to strengthen security and cooperation.

Once again, long years of difficult talks — first in Belgrade, then in Madrid — were needed to overcome the stubborn resistance of the United States and its main NATO allies to the further development of the all-European cooperation process. What tricks American diplomacy resorted to at those meetings so as to poison their atmosphere and thereby hamper the attainment of agreement!

However, when alarm began to well up in connection with the fact that the present American Administration had broken off a whole series of talks started earlier and had stepped up the arms race beyond belief, clearly working toward confrontation in Europe, even the close U.S. allies started coming out in favor of resuming the process which started in Helsinki.

The decision to hold the Stockholm conference was received with relief throughout the world as a victory for common sense. Considerable hopes were pinned on this conference, since the mandate it was given in Madrid stated clearly and unambiguously that its aim "is the gradual implementation of new, effective, concreate actions aimed at developing progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament, in order to put into practice and express the obligation of states TO REFRAIN FROM THE USE OF FORCE OR THE THREAT OF FORCE IN RELATIONS WITH EACH OTHER" [my emphasis -- Yu Zh].

To what extent do the positions adopted by the participants in the Stockholm conference accord with that mandate?

Two Approaches

Anyone carefully observing the progress of the Stockholm conference could not fail to note that the representatives of the USSR and the other socialist countries are acting strictly in accordance with the mandate worked out in Madrid. At the very start of the conference A.A. Gromyko submitted for examination a wide range of large-scale proposals whose adoption would make it possible to implement a change for the better in the development of the European situation.

First, there is the proposal for all the states taking part in the conference which possess nuclear weapons to adopt a pledge not to use them first.

Second, there is the proposal that an international agreement on the mutual nonuse of military force and on maintaining relations of peace be achieved in practice. Such an agreement could be embodied, in particular, in an appropriate treaty between the North Atlantic Alliance countries and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Of course, if a consensus on these vital issues were achieved in Stockholm, firm foundations would thereby be created for confidence between states in Europe, and not only in Europe.

The strenthening of confidence would undoubtedly also be promoted by the constructive, businesslike examination of such vitally important issues as, for instance, reducing military spending, freeing Europe from chemical weapons, and creating nuclear-free zones.

Finally, considerable significance would be attached to an agreement on confidence-building measures to develop the relevant provisions of the CSCE Final Act. In particular, this means advance briefings on major military exercises by ground forces; limiting the scale of exercises; and advance briefings on major movements of armed forces and on air force and naval exercises in the sea and ocean regions adjacent to Europe and in its airspace.

What stance did the U.S. and NATO countries' representatives adopt?

The merger "package" of proposals submitted 6 days after the USSR representative's speech was merely a collection of measures meeting the interests of American military intelligence and doing nothing to help develop confidence between states.

What kind of proposals are these? the reader will ask. Here they are: a broad "exchange of military information" up to and including the disclosure of the structure of ground forces and land-based air forces; an annual exchange of advance plans for all types of military activity; briefings on that activity, including out-of-barracks activity by ground forces and mobilization measures; the invitation of observers to all types of military activity; monitoring of the observance of these measures...

You may ask: The exchange of information presumably means a two-way process? Alas, the actions proposed by the United States and NATO would not be in the least two-way! Their plans for, as they call it, "ensuring openness" or "transparency" in effect RULE OUT "OPENNESS" OR TRANSPARENCY" ON THE PART OF THE MAIN U.S. ARMED FORCES, AND ALSO OF THEIR COUNTLESS MILITARY BASES WHICH ARE LOCATED OUTSIDE EUROPE BUT ARE DESIGNED FOR STRIKES AGAINST THE USSR AND THE OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES.

Thus the authors of these plans would like to put the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries in a glass case, while carefully concealing their own in an impenetrable steel case.

And as for the really large-scale confidence-building measures proposed by the USSR, Washington is reluctant even to hear about them, falsely saying they are just for "show" or "propaganda."

Unscrupulous Methods

Naturally, this approach, which is at best frivolous and demagogic, toward the conduct of the Stockholm talks, on which the peace-loving public of the whole world are still pinning their hopes -- all the more so because many other very important negotiations have been torpedoed by the United States! -- is giving rise to increasing protests and condemnation from peace-loving forces.

Washington is now undertaking new unscrupulous attempts to mislead public opinion and escape censure. Assistant U.S. Secretary of State R. Burt, who specializes in such unseemly methods, met with American and foreign journalists in the Washington press center and delivered expatiations presenting the entire course of the Stockholm conference in a false light.

R. Burt permitted himself to state that "The Soviet Union made no (?!) official proposals during the first round." Moreover, he claimed that "the Soviet representative spent most of the first round attacking (?) Western countries." "However," R. Burt went on, persisting in his false assertions, "as I have already said, the Russians made no proposals (!) on confidence and security building measures."

On reading this statement by an official you wonder: how low have these gentlemen sunk in refusing to follow the elementary norms of decency. Mister R. Burt could not but know that the journalists listening to him must be familiar with the content of the large-scale Soviet proposals which await examination at the Stockholm conference. He could not but know that those proposals aroused great interest in many participants in the conference. Ambassador Curt Lidgard, head of the Swedish delegation, stated, for instance, that the USSR's proposals are concrete enough to form a basis for talks. Nonetheless R. Burt stubbornly claims that there is no trace of any such proposals!

His attempts to publicize the U.S. and NATO "package of proposals" also looked highly unconvincing. He described the submission of this "package" as "the most important event in the first round of the conference," and said that "the conference's main attention was focused on the proposals submitted by the NATO countries."

R. Burt was all the same unable to totally ignore the fact that the demagogic and flagrantly unrealistic U.S. and NATO proposals aroused skepticism among the Stockholm conference participants. He therefore said through gritted teeth that "the NATO states and the neutral and nonaligned countries must (!) reach agreement on the basic principles" and that "even with the divergences in views, it is useful to keep open the channels between us."

Those are the facts, which show who is promoting the establishment of confidence between states in Europe, and who is hampering it. The position adopted in Stockholm by the U.S. representatives and their main NATO allies is causing growing alarm among peace-loving forces in Europe.

People cannot help seeing that these representatives in seeking "transparency" of the socialist countries' armed forces, are acting in unison with the Pentagon, which nurtures plans fraught with the danger of nuclear catastrophe.

People cannot help seeing that they are trying to impose these plans on the Stockholm conference at a time when American missiles which constitute nuclear first-strike weapons are being deployed in the FRG, Britain, and Italy.

That is why, as the second round in the Stockholm conference approaches -- it is to resume work on 8 May -- there are intensifying demands everywhere to the participants to rebuff American diplomacy's attempts to paralyze it and turn it into another arena for futile verbal fencing. In numerous messages, appeals, and petitions with many thousands of signatures, people belonging to various antiwar movements are imperiously demanding the more rapid resolution of the urgent problems on which the strengthening of confidence between states, and therefore the consolidation of peace, depends.

BOGACHEV: REAGAN TO CONTINUE ARMS POLICIES

LD281443 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 28 Mar 84

["U.S. President's Election Tall Stories" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Ronald Reagan's address yesterday to the conference of American insurance agents is fresh evidence that the United States President, who is running for a second term in the White House, is not going to budge an inch of his policy of building up international tensions, of using the nuclear weapons race as the main tool of the United States foreign policy.

Cutting in his address vulgar jokes about the intention of his rivals in the election campaign to conclude with the Soviet Union a treaty on arms control and jeering at their striving to display goodwill and sincerity in international relations, the United States President did not resist temptation to tell for the umpteenth time cock-and-bull stories that in the seventies, prior to his taking office of United States President, the USA allegedly disregarded problems of military construction.

Hence, Reagan claimed, it is urgently necessary to build up intensively the American means of mass annihilation of people, which he is doing now.

In citing fantastic figures about the alleged growth of the Soviet Union's nuclear might in the seventies, the President did not wish, for certain reasons, to tell the insurance agents that from 1970 to 1980 the number of nuclear warheads of the United States strategic force alone grew from 5,100 to almost 10,000.

The incessant build-up of the U.S. nuclear weapons in the past decade was achieved not only through an increase in the number of nuclear warheads, but also through a considerable improvement of their accuracy. It is precisely in the seventies that the United States designed the modern strategic weapons systems -- the strategic cruise missiles of various types, the inter-continental ballistic missile "MX", the strategic bomber "B-1", the new accurate warheads of nuclear missiles.

In the seventies, the USA started building the latest nuclear-powered submarines and "Trident-1" missiles for them.

Over that period, the potentialities of the U.S. strategic offensive force for the delivery in a single launch (sortie) of nuclear warheads doubled without an increase in the number of carriers. Their combat potential increased considerably as regards hitting superhard silos and the flexibility of their combat use.

It is hard to believe that the United States President, who is also the commander-in-chief of the country's armed forces, did not know or forgot the commonly-known facts.

The latest speech by President Reagan shows in particular that the falsification of facts in connection with the balance of nuclear forces in the world will be as before used as the basis of the arguments of the present United States Administration an unrestrained build-up of the military efforts of the United States.

SPACE-BASED ANTIMISSILE DEFENSE 'VIOLATION'

LD281441 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Today I would like to turn to the reaction caused by U.S. plans for the militarization of space.

The plans are extremely dangerous and our listeners in their frequent letters expect questions on this, specifically, our constant listener, Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov from the village of Krivozerka in Penza Oblast.

Well, Washington has published a document entitled Space-Based Antimissile Defense. It was prepared by the prestigious U.S. physicists from the Union of Concerned Scientists. The document concludes that the establishment of antimissile defense systems in space, in accordance with President Reagan's plans, would lead to an escalation in quantity and quality of the arms race and increase the risk of nuclear war. My colleague Yevgeniy Kachanov will comment on this report:

[Kachanov] It must be said at once, comrades, that the report by the U.S. scientists is concerned with U.S. intentions to put an armed space station into orbit around the earth. It will be capable, writes ASSOCIATED PRESS, of destroying enemy missiles long before they approach their targets. However, this is only one of the elements in an extensive program for militarizing space, which President Reagan announced exactly 1 year ago.

In the existing plans, 56 antisatellite systems are to be deployed by 1987 and subsequently their number will be again doubled. Work on the development of laser and beam weapons is in full swing, also destined for deployment in space. The escalation, both in quantity and quality, of the arms race, is self-evident, as you can see. However, the antimissile system, as the U.S. scientist John Pine believes, is a first-strike weapon, and not at all a defensive one, as the Washington administration asserts. This enormously increases the risk of a thermonuclear disaster.

The expression star wars, the name of the science-fiction cinema hit, has now become almost commonplace in the pages of U.S. papers. It even seems to me that it is being deliberately inculcated into readers, so that they get used to the idea that a war in space will be scarcely more dangerous than, say, the aggression against little Grenada.

The technical details or the financial aspects of the plans are deliberatly over-emphasized but the legal aspects and those of international law of the militarization of space are being omitted just as deliberately; they are being hushed up. It is these very aspects that are the most vulnerable link in President Reagan's program.

The establishment of a new, powerful antimissile defense system with space-based elements, on which the United States has embarked, is a blatant violation of the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems between the USSR and the United States, signed in 1972 -- not only signed, but also ratified by the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Former U.S. Defense Secretary Brown, in an NBC interview, described this treaty as the most major achievement in the arms-control sphere. The report from the U.S. scientists notes that the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems is in the interests of the two great powers. However, a refusal to observe it would be equivalent to a rejection of the entire arms-control process. Such a step, the document says, would entail disastrous political and military consequences of the highest degree for Soviet-American relations.

The treaty is not only in effect, it is termless. The Soviet Union advocates most resolutely its absolute observance. This is demanded by all to whom the interests of peace on our planet are dear.

PENTAGON 'TENTACLES' REACHING FOR SPACE

LD281836 Moscow TASS in English 1709 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The Pentagon announced appointment of James Abrahamson, a lieutenant general of the U.S. Air Force, as director of the programme to develop the U.S. strategic ABM defence. For the coming five years the Reagan administration has appropriated up to 27 billion dollars for the programme. At present, Abrahamson is one of those in charge of the programme for the development and exploitation of the "shuttle" reusable space craft, with the bulk of the programme geared to military uses of outer space.

Abrahamson's appointment seems to create a "bridge" between the further development of ABM systems and the use of space for military ends. The Reagan administration is clearly determined to violate the agreements with the Soviet Union on ABM systems limitation, as well as on the non-use of space for military purposes, in a bid to do its utmost to achieve a military edge over the USSR even at the price of violating the existing bilateral and international agreements.

In 1972, following its painstaking elaboration by the experts, the treaty was concluded between the USA and the Soviet Union on limiting the ABM systems. Under the treaty, the sides agreed to ban the creation of ABM systems in the territories of each of the two countries, as well as the establishment of foundations for such a system. It was implied that in these conditions each of the sides would remain open for a retaliatory nuclear blow, and so neither would risk to be the first to press the nuclear pushbutton.

The treaty on limiting the ABM systems preserves its validity, and thus must be complied with regardless of whether some in Washington like it or not. However, with the "Reagan team's" coming to the White House, the agreements reached by the previous U.S. Administrations with other states began to be regarded as an obstacle in the way of a build up of U.S. nuclear arms, and as a hindrance to the pursuit of a policy of open militarism. One after another, there began to make their appearance in Washington doctrines of "the first nuclear strike," and those of a "limited" and global nuclear wars. Preparing for these wars, the Pentagon has now reached out for space with its tentacles. The "Directive No 119" signed by Reagan provides for embarking on a broad programme of research and development to emplace in space advanced systems of weaponry with a capability of "repelling a nuclear attack by the adversary." As we can see, the resort is once again made to the old bogie of a "Soviet threat," this time in order to gain dominant positions in outer space and in space around the earth and to dictate U.S. conditions to mankind."

All these actions of the U.S. Administration are totally incompatible with the many documents of the U.N. General Assembly, banning the use of space for military ends, and are at variance with the U.S.-Soviet agreement on cooperation in the exploration and exploitation of space for peaceful purposes. To pile up increasingly sophisticated weapons is not the best way to enhance security.

The U.S. Administration is also drawing other countries into the arms race in space, including Japan, from which Washington is trying to obtain the most advanced technologies for use above all in the military field, including in space. U.S. space tracking stations are being deployed around the entire world, including Australia, Africa, and other regions. Last Tuesday an agreement was signed with Portugal to build on the continental part of its territory a station for tracking artificial space objects.

The station will be linked with the U.S. united command for the Aerospace Defense of North America (NORAD). It is not difficult to see that all these actions of the U.S. Administration have a very dangerous character, for in pursuing their preparations for a nuclear war, which is also expected to be waged in space. The Washington leaders strive to safeguard their own security at the expense of other countries and to [passage indistinct] them to protect the U.S. territory, to use them as nuclear hostages.

U.S. 'SLANDERS' USSR TO BOOST ARMS PROGRAMS

PM280929 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA political observer V. Falin: "Richard Perle's Pearls"]

[Text] Once upon a time forgers tried to make sure that they were not caught red-handed. They preferred dim twilight to bright spotlights. They used to be especially thorough in covering up their profits and strove to avoid direct involvement in the actual deception. You could suppose, guess, or presume as much as you liked. But there was no material evidence. Guilt cannot be established without such evidence and, after all, people are innocent unless proven guilty.

Times change, fashions also change. A Washington government document from 1950 expressed the hope that in the not too distant future the United States would reach "a certain level in its potential" when it would no longer be necessary to whisper around corners, put on a public smile, or act the role of lovers of peace, when it would become possible to head straight for the target. In the meantime, it was recommended that state services string one forgery to another in order to turn the people, blinded by untruths, into a flock of sheep.

And it worked. The Truman administration inflated the number of Soviet bombers three- and fourfold in order to get appropriations for the arms race out of Congress. The crafty men serving in J. Kennedy's administration exaggerated thirtyfold the data on Soviet missiles. As former Pentagon staffer D. Ellsberg attests, the swindlers were exceptionally proud of themselves. In their words, "there was no other way to obtain sufficient financial resources for the development of weapons systems needed to maintain our (American) superiority, and that was a real problem." A forgery? Of course it was a forgery, but as a result "now the United States has Minutemen missiles and B-52 bombers."

I can give dozens and hundreds of other examples of cynical and cold-blooded forgeries originating deep inside the military departments, the State Department, the special services, and Congress. For some of them Washington invented the tag "diversionary actions." Others were classified as "technical errors" or "human weakness." Most of them were included among acts and actions on which there is "no discussion" and "no comment." Like, for example, the circumstances of the U.S. interventions in Guatemala or Cuba, the Dominican Republic or Chile, Congo or Angola, Vietnam, Kampuchea, or Laos, Iran or Afghanistan, Grenada or Lebanon. Things have reached the point when intrigues and deception have started being included among state prerogatives. Without them, it is claimed, it is impossible to conduct secret affairs, and without these a state is not a state. This is how it has been and, if we are to agree with the Washington interpreters of legality and morals, this is how it will always be.

There is no point arguing about tastes or inclinations. In this case, however, we are not talking about tastes but about convictions on which ideological programs, political platforms, and military doctrines are built. What is the point in heaping curses if they are left just hanging in the air? If the weapons are there, the enemy will appear by himself. The potential opponent acquires specific features as soon as the capability to combat him emerges and the appropriate psychological atmosphere is created at home.

While presenting its policy as some kind of revelation, the present administration is even less inclined than its predecessors to abide by the rules of propriety and other conventions. Could it be that it has come to believe that the "level" which has been sought since 1950 has been surpassed? Whereas in H. Truman's time the State Department had its special "psychological strategy" administration, nowadays the U.S. diplomatic department appears increasingly often as a branch of such an administration. Whereas D. Eisenhower was advised by a special staff adviser on "psychological warfare questions," R. Reagan is his own boss in this sphere. Whereas the basest disinformation was turned over to anonymous figures or clerks in the past, today it is dealt with by assistant and deputy secretaries, secretaries, and the President personally. Whereas in the past imperial shame was hidden behind the "top secret" stamp, since the start of the current decade it has not been considered disgraceful to display it publicly.

Everything is subordinated to recreating the "enemy's image" which faded during the time of detente. And nothing can be achieved here without slander. And this process is progressing along the usual well-trodden path without hitches. This is how it is done.

The technology for the fundamentally new binary chemical weapons is ready. The U.S. Army is craving to get its hand on it. How to begin? The simplest thing is to organize a furor and allege that the Soviet Union is preparing actively for chemical and bacteriological warfare and is already treacherously testing various types of toxic combat agents in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. We Americans do nothing but argue all the time, while the communists have been fighting with chemical weapons for a long time. How long can this be tolerated?

They produced one government report on this issue, then five, then ten. They cooked up a row at the United Nations. General B. Rogers was launched into orbit, to be followed by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and his comrades-in-arms, and then by Secretary of State G. Shultz. Finally, it was the President's turn to don a fig leaf stained by some mysterious yellow spots. Commissions were set up to unravel the mystery, and then -- the bubble burst. While the high-ranking officials came, sniffed, and immediately understood what the boss wanted, the foreign and independent U.S. experts rejected the story of the "yellow rain" originating in Moscow. The well-known U.S. expert and Harvard University Professor M. Meselson cited convincing arguments to support the conclusion that the unfortunate spots are the result of wild bees' activity. What an unenviable finish -- to drown in excrement. But what can we do -- no one forced Washington to do it.

Admit that they have made a mistake? They are fighting their way out of this affair. In his 23 January report to Congress R. Reagan -- closely followed by the State Department on 21 February -- repeated the absolutely groundless attacks against the USSR. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle was brought into action by the government 14 March. Enlightening members of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the subject of "the Soviet Union's violations of important arms control agreements," he decided to resort to the method known from the Munchausen legend as pulling oneself out of the swamp by one's own hair. While confirming the official story about the "yellow rain," Perle hinted that "this weapon is now being used on a diminishing scale." Consequently, the administration's efforts have not been in vain, the Russians are "backing down," and pressure is yielding its "fruit." Not a word, of course, about the bees. Not a sound about the fact that, behind the screen of "yellow rain," the administration has undertaken the modernization of U.S. chemical arsenals and that this rain has abundantly watered the seeds of mistrust in disarmament agreements. There was no need for anything else. The deed was done. The retreat could be sounded.

Stereotype. Even primitive. The Americans' political inventiveness, however, does not sparkle with originality. They are often completely satisfied with an uncomplicated plan, unimaginative black and white tones, a broad sword instead of a scalpel. If Perle were to be singled out for anything in this respect, it would be for irrepressible overconfidence and an ability to talk nonsense without turning a hair and to skillfully dodge the truth. As people say, you never know where you are with such individuals. Speaking before the more than likely flabbergasted senators, he confirmed this reputation of his yet again.

"We consider the spirit of the agreements a guideline for their implementation," the assistant secretary declared. "The Russians are perfectly aware," he went on, "that we fully observe our obligations in the arms control sphere.... Our administration is fully resolved to conclude effective, meaningful, and verifiable agreements on arms reduction."

Not a bad turn of phrase, is it? Especially bearing in mind that these sentences are uttered by a Pentagon official who is considered one of the most skillful promoters of militarism. R. Perle's main postulate is to attain U.S. military superiority by any means. He has participated directly in the formulation not only of the Reagan administration's basic military programs but also of concepts governing the practical use of the weapons that are being developed and of directives which, without beating about the bush, set the task of destroying the Soviet Union as a state and as a social system. Coming from Perle, the man who has repeatedly given the SALT II treaty a pauper's burial, who has denigrated the Soviet-American cooperation of the seventies, and who has abused the policy of detente with his latest words, "incantations about "observing the spirit of the letter of agreements" and all the other suchlike statements have an uncommonly "weighty" ring to them.

Could it be that what Perle had in mind were exclusively the agreements formulated by the Reagan administration? If so, we can understand him. Since there are no such agreements, there are no American violations. Washington is therefore boundlessly loyal to the incorporeal spirit of "effective and meaningful" agreements existing only in the Pentagon's imagination. Agreements that are clearly unacceptable for the USSR and thus, one must think, deliberately doomed to be breached by Moscow even if they were concluded.

There ought to be some silence from the spokesman of a government which has refused to validate the SALT II treaty and behaves irresponsibly toward the entire political and legal heritage of the joint efforts made by the Soviet Union and the United States in the disarmament sphere. But Perle is not to be embarrassed by facts. A certain amount of violence against logic, some brazenness, an ability to twist facts, and -- lo and behold -- the blame for the dangerous exacerbation in the world rests with the USSR.

Rather neat, isn't it? In Washington's "firm belief," the Soviet side "has almost certainly violated the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems," has probably violated the limitation on new types of ICBM established by the SALT II treaty," and "has probably violated the treaty on the limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons" -- this is Perle's first thesis. "Some of these violations must have been planned many years ago and, in some cases, probably at the very time the Soviet Union was entering into these agreements" -- this is his second thesis. "If the Russians will not observe the arms control provisions, this entire process will evolve into nothing else but an exercise in unilateral disarmament" -- runs his third thesis. All together, we have a combination of three elements whose meaning is obvious.

Bad treaties must not be ratified; they are twice as bad because their provisions are being "violated by the Soviets," and three times as bad since the Russians intended to circumvent all the treaties even before they signed them. Therefore, no one must blame the U.S. Government for refusing to fall into the trap. This government deserves all praise for the fact that it saw through the dirty trick in good time. The agreements concluded before Reagan are compared by Perle to "paper castles" that will not withstand the winds of war. Let the USSR look for a way out of this cheerless situation. The "shining-eyed" United States, like Caesar's wife, is above suspicion.

Downright gibberish, but this is what the administration offers to the Senate as its "constructive approach" to the arms control problem, contrary to the actual facts which are known to the whole world. Perle has been assigned the duty of singing panegyrics to the American record of treaty practice [dogovornaya praktika] and uphold the United States' reputation as a partner which has fallen to an extremely low level.

All in all, this is not a new theme. The end of January saw the publication of a Soviet memorandum handed to the U.S. State Department, which used strict facts instead of "opinions," "impressions," "must have been," or "probably," to show the real state of affairs regarding the violation and observance of treaties. So far the U.S. side has not yet provided an answer to the questions raised in the memorandum. In order to avoid getting into unpleasant matters, the Soviet representation was declared to be "propaganda." How else would it have been possible to prove that the deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles in West Europe allegedly corresponds with the SALT II treaty? Or that the construction of several new phased array radar stations in the United States and the preparations to deploy ABM systems in space are totally in line with the ABM treaty, and so on?

R. Perle and those behind him presume, to judge by everything, that when a lie is repeated sufficiently often and "authoritatively," opposition to the untruth will diminish. At the same time, it may be possible to expand the circle of members of the populace who begin to suspect that there is fire behind the smoke. And this is already something. Starting capital is emerging from nothing. By making skillful use of it, it will be possible to implant among taxpayers the conclusion which the assistant secretary drummed into the senators' heads: "In view of these violations (of concluded treaties by the Soviet Union) it is absolutely necessary to grant all funds requested by the President for the strategic arms production program." And he also made it clear: Get used to large figures, it is possible that the Pentagon's appetite may grow even larger.

So there it is, the sting in the tail. It was for its sake that the masters of slander racked their brains. If you want more funds for weapons -- heap more calumny on the Soviet Union. The more fables you concoct about Soviet plans and intentions, the fuller and more varied will be the range of American arms. This is how they have acted throughout the postwar period. Not because anyone was threatening the United States, but only because during all these years the American imperial crown has not been short of pearls who have vandalized common sense and deceived their own and other peoples.

CHINESE-JAPANESE TALKS, PLANS ASSESSED

Ties' 'Special Nature' Seen

PM290743 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Japanese-Chinese Talks"]

[Text] Beijing, 27 Mar -- The talks between Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone and the Chinese leaders have come to an end. The speeches of the two countries' leaders, like the articles in the Chinese propaganda organs, persistently cited the thesis of "the special nature" of Sino-Japanese relations, their special place in China's foreign policy, and the close cooperation between Beijing and Tokyo.

Foreign correspondents covering the visit note that the Japanese-Chinese talks began with anti-Soviet declarations on both sides. In particular, the Japanese premier attacked the Soviet Union's defense policy in the Far East. Here he said that because of the question of the so-called "Northern Territories," Japan is not prepared for progress in Soviet-Japanese relations. The Chinese leaders' statements also contained utterances Japan is not prepared for progress in Soviet-Japanese relations. The Chinese leaders' statements also contained utterances unfriendly to the Soviet Union and assessments which distort the USSR's foreign policy in Asia and the Far East.

The talks discussed China's and Japan's relations with the United States. The Chinese leaders, the press reports, stated that Beijing's relations with Washington are improving and that China intends to continue to develop these relations on a stable basis. The Japanese side stressed that the United States is their main military ally.

Economic Relations Extended

LD271829 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 27 Mar 84

[Text] Beijing March 27 TASS -- Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone ended his talks with Chinese leaders. The leaders of the two countries and Chinese propaganda pointedly emphasized that Sino-Japanese relations were "special" and had a particular role to play in Chinese foreign policy. Also, close cooperation between Beijing and Tokyo was stressed.

Foreign correspondents who covered the visit point out that the Japanese-Chinese talks began with the two sides making anti-Soviet declarations. In particular, the Japanese premier attacked Soviet defence policy in the Far East. He also stated that Japan was not ready for progress in Soviet-Japanese relations because of the problem of "Northern Territories."

Chinese leaders also made statements which were unfriendly towards the Soviet Union and distorted Soviet foreign policy in Asia and the Far East.

Judging by press reports, much attention was given at the talks to cooperation between China and Japan in Asia and the Pacific. The idea was put forward that that cooperation was the "cornerstone" of stability in the region and that Japan and China had "special responsibility" for affairs in Asian countries.

The sides discussed the relations of China and Japan with the United States. Chinese leaders stated, according to press reports, that Beijing's relations with Washington were improving and that China intended to continue to develop those relations on a stable basis. The Japanese side stressed that the United States was Japan's major military ally.

Further steps were taken during Nakasone's visit to extend economic relations between China and Japan. In particular, the Japanese premier is reported to have agreed to give China long-term loans totalling about two billion dollars. The Chinese side spoke in favour of opening up its market to Japanese companies willing to invest in the Chinese economy.

The sides also discussed prospects for cooperation between the two countries in the nuclear field. It was decided to speed up the drafting of an intergovernmental agreement to that effect and to take a number of other measures stimulating cooperation between Japan and China.

Hanoi March 27 TASS -- The newspaper NHAN DAN published an article devoted to Nakasone's visit to China. It points out that Beijing viewed Nakasone's visit as a "great event" and "a milestone in the history of long-term relations between China and Japan." Indeed, the Japanese-Chinese alliance has been making rapid progress since relations between the two countries were normalized.

Nakasone's visit to China was intended to strengthen contacts between Washington, Tokyo and Beijing as these contacts have a special role to play in U.S. global strategy and in Japan's long-term strategic plans in Asia and the Pacific.

GROMYKO, MONGOLIAN FOREIGN MINISTER HOLD TALKS

PM291045 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "In An Atmosphere of Freindship and Unity"]

[Text] Moscow March 28 -- Talks were held in the Kremlin today between member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Foreign Minister of the USSR Andrey Gromyko and member of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Foreign Minister of Mongolia Mangalyn Dugersuren.

During the talks, which were held in the spirit of complete mutual understanding and unity, the sides exchanged opinions on the further development of fraternal relations between the USSR and Mongolia and discussed topical international issues of mutual interest, especially concerning the situation in Asia.

Andrey Gromyko and Mangalyn Dugersuren noted with great satisfaction the variety of forms and areas of constantly deepening Soviet-Mongolian cooperation in different fields for the benefit of the peoples of both countries, in the interests of the entire socialist community, and of the cause of peace and security on earth.

Profound concern was expressed over the sharp aggravation of international tension caused by the aggressive forces of U.S. imperialism. The special danger of the Washington administration's actions in fueling new conflicts on the Asian Continent and encouraging militarist trends in Japan's policy was stressed.

Readiness was stated on the part of the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic to work steadily and consistently to ease tensions in Asia and establish relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation between the Asian countries.

On the same day, Andrey Gromyko gave luncheon in honor of Mangalyn Dugersuren.

The luncheon, held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, was attended by Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Rusakov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Ziya Nuriyev, ministers of the USSR, and other officials.

MPR PUBLIC BACKS GOVERNMENT STAND ON USSR TROOPS

PM281341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 84 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Shpakov dispatch: "Broad Support"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar -- The Mongolian Government's statement of 2 March this year elicited broad public response. It made a principled assessment of the stand of the Chinese side, which has put forward a number of preliminary conditions for the normalization of relations between the USSR and the PRC which affect third countries, including a demand for the withdrawal from Mongolia of Soviet military units temporarily stationed on its territory. The Mongolian Government, the statement reads, categorically rejects that demand, since this question "is exclusively an internal matter for our state and concerns only Mongolian-Soviet relations."

The editorial offices of central and local Mongolian newspapers are receiving numerous letters from readers voicing full support for the propositions and conclusions set forth in the government document. Prof (Ch. Dolgor), honored doctor of the republic; Mongolian Hero of Labor (Ts. Namkhaynyambu), herdsman from Dzavhan Aymag; the writer (B. Nyama), and others voice their resolute protest at the Beijing leadership's allegations of a mythical threat supposedly stemming from Mongolian territory with regard to China. "We are indignant at attempts to cast doubts on the Soviet and Mongolian peoples' love of peace," (L. Dashnyam). Worker at the Ulaanbaatar Production Association of Sewn Goods Enterprises and deputy of the Mongolian People's Great Hural, writes in the pages of UNEN. "Our countries have never threatened anyone and they have a single aim -- peaceful creative labor."

Mongolian political commentators point out that the Mongolian Government has repeatedly stated at the highest level its interest in better relations between the USSR and the PRC, seeing this as an important factor for improving the political situation on the Asian Continent and strengthening peace and security throughout the world. The Mongolian side also consistently advocates the normalization of Mongolian-Chinese relations on the basis of the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, equal rights, nonuse of force, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Unfortunately, the Mongolian press points out, Beijing continues to adhere to positions of hegemonism with regard to Mongolia. Articles presenting Mongolia's history in a distorted light and denying its sovereignty continue to appear in the Chinese mass media.

Mongolia's working people want to live in peace and friendship with all peoples. They sincerely seek to develop relations with the PRC. However, these relations must be built on mutual respect and on observance of the generally accepted norms of international law. "Guided by the sincere desire to restore good-neighborliness and cooperation with its southern neighbor, the newspaper UNEN points out, "Mongolia has repeatedly advanced and continues to advance specific proposals aimed at settling disputed questions and strengthening Asian security. Unfortunately, not only has the Chinese side not treated with understanding Mongolia's proposal to elaborate and conclude a convention on mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of force in relations among Asian and Pacific states, but it is still remaining silent about this constructive initiative."

The question of the presence of Soviet military units on Mongolian territory cannot be a topic for discussion in Soviet-Chinese political consultations and must not be an obstacle to normalizing relations between the USSR and the PRC. This is the unanimous opinion of the Mongolian people, who have wholly and fully supported the statement by their country's government.

NAKASONE ADMITS NUCLEAR WAR OPERATION PLANS

LD281122 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Tokyo March 28 TASS -- Correspondent [as received] Vasiliy Golovnin reporting:

Speaking in the Budget Committee of the Upper Chamber of the Japanese Parliament, Akira Kuroyanagi, deputy from the Komeito (Clean Government) Party, disclosed that in case of emergency, for instance, combat action involving the use of nuclear arms, the Japanese armed forces were to launch operations to detect and suppress the launching facilities of the nuclear systems of the enemy. The deputy said that he had documents of the Military Command which called into question the sincerity of the government assurances that Japan was not studying or exercising operations involving the use of mass annihilation weapons.

Faced with the incontrovertible facts cited by the deputy, Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone admitted there were plans for combat operations in foreign territory in case of nuclear war. He maintained, however, that preparations for them were conducted strictly within the limits of a justified defense.

Lately, Tokyo has been interpreting those limits increasingly liberally. Only a few days ago Yasuhiro Nakasone made a statement that the possession of a "minimum" of nuclear capability could have a "defensive character" and did not contradict the Constitution which unequivocally prohibited the country to have its armed forces. Moreover, the press has learned that the Japanese troops, acting in one team with the U.S. units stationed in Japan, have more than once drilled operations preparing themselves for a possible nuclear war. The newspaper AKAHATA wrote that for that purpose a special range was established on the island of Hokkaido where the use of mass annihilation weapons is being imitated. This shows that the Japanese armed forces are being increasingly integrated into the military machine of the Pentagon which is preparing for "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars in Asia and the Pacific, the newspaper stresses.

JAPAN'S 'OFFICIAL' ANTI-SOVETISM SPURS BAD TIES

PM290854 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 5

[Political observer V. Kudryavtsev article: "The Far East Needs Actions Too"]

[Text] If you look at the Japanese press every day, you cannot fail to reach the conclusion that the Japanese public is very disturbed and concerned at the present state of Japanese-Soviet relations. This is perfectly natural, since the Soviet Union is a very close neighbor of Japan, and peace and security in the Far East, as well as throughout the West Pacific region, depend to a huge degree on their relationship. Tribute must be paid to the fairness of the bulk of the Japanese press in that it evaluates Japanese-Soviet relations quite objectively and, most importantly, equally objectively identifies the reasons for the "very low level" of these relations, as the newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN wrote recently, citing the opinion of Japanese Foreign Ministry circles.

In this search for the truth, in my view, it is very significant that, although the newspapers do not manage without what I would call "official" anti-Sovietism, they generally see the Y. Nakasone's government policy as the primary cause of the bad relations between Japan and the USSR. This was expressed most vividly by the newspaper MAINICHI (note that this is one of Japan's leading newspapers), which declared that the reasons for the deterioration in Japanese-Soviet relations lie in "Y. Nakasone's diplomacy." "Insufficient independence in policy toward the USSR," the newspaper emphasizes, "is a fatal shortcoming of Japan's foreign policy. In its policy, the Nakasone administration has recently cooperated rather rashly with President Reagan's tough course. This creates the impression that Nakasone follows the United States too obediently to the detriment of independence." Perhaps this is the wrong place to cite that newspaper at such length, but it seems to me that this quotation shows the extent to which the policy of the Nakasone government toward the Soviet Union varies with public opinion. It is particularly important to point this out because representatives of Japan's ruling circles very riskily camoufalge their pro-American and anti-Soviet policy with references to the "demands" of the broad masses of the Japanese population.

However, the opinion of the Japanese general public, which is critical of Nakasone's policy, is so well reasoned that it is making the country's ruling circles somewhat alter the tone of their foreign policy statements. Thus, reporting that on 26 February the

Japanese Government decided in principle to "ease" the sanctions against the Soviet Union in connection with Afghan events (chiefly concerning the exchange of delegations), the newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN writes that signs of a relaxation of East-West tension have recently begun to show -- in which connection the Japanese Government has decided to seek ways to improve relations with the USSR. The prime minister himself had spoken of this 8 February, albeit at...a provocative rally in Tokyo called to mark "Northern Territories Day."

It is this "combination" -- lipservice to improved Japanese-Soviet relations and actual steps aimed at worsening relations between the two countries -- that is very characteristic of the Nakasone administration's policy toward the Soviet Union. Like a two-faced Janus: one face turned, as it were, toward Japanese public opinion, and the other looking over the ocean toward the Reagan administration. Incidentally, this too has been borrowed from Washington, which has recently been posing verbally as a "peacemaker" while in fact acting as an inveterate militarist. The impression is created that the Nakasone government is trying to adapt to the Reagan administration's vacillations between words and actions. It immediately copies all the sanctions taken by the United States against the Soviet Union, and at the same time, is afraid of being late to cut them back, since they have been discovered, in fact, to be directed rather against Japan itself. For it is no coincidence that after each new sanction there is increased U.S. pressure on Japan in trade and finance. Characteristically, the Japanese Government has started speaking of the need to improve Japanese-Soviet relations, not so much on the basis of the country's national interests as in view of the fact that "signs of a relaxation of East-West tension have begun to emerge." Better not be late! Here, too, the pointer on the scales of the American "words and actions" policy plunges Japanese politician-mimics into confusion. And yet we are talking of the country which holds second place in the capitalist world in terms of its level of economic development and which is bidding for an equally high place and role in international politics!

While offering verbal assurances that there are no obstacles on the Japanese side to an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union, in fact the Japanese side is laying down conditions which actually lead only to still greater tension in the Far East situation.

An example is the provocative so-called problem of the "Northern Territories." It is being fanned -- including by the premier himself -- to arouse anti-Soviet revanchism, which is used as justification for the growth of arms in violation of the present Constitution. But recently the pro-American aspect of this problem, if it can be called such, has also been clearly revealed. The American imperialists need it as an "overture" in mounting the campaign for the revision of postwar borders generally and for the revision of the results of World War II.

American prompting can also be sensed in the way in which Japan increasingly frequently puts itself forward for the role of the Far East equivalent of NATO West Europe. At the same time, negative propaganda hypocritically complains that the Soviet Union ought not to ignore (!) Japan in international politics (TOKYO SHIMBUN). All this has been invented and does not accord with actual reality. On the contrary, the Soviet Union has repeatedly emphasized Japan's important role in asserting peace and security in the Far East. It is the fault of Japan itself that its role in the Far East and in the international arena generally is subordinated to U.S. interests. This is also recognized by the Japanese press, which expresses to one degree or another the opinion of the broad public.

Naturally, the Soviet Union cannot disregard such a state of affairs. Only Japan itself can change it.

It is absurd to make demands on the Soviet Union with regard to enhancing Japan's international role. Japan's place in international affairs depends on its own position. And at present this position is as follows: The United States is virtually turning Japan into an unofficial NATO member and is using Japanese diplomacy in West Europe to pressure its European allies, who are discontented with Washington's policy on trade and financial relations and with the deployment of new nuclear missiles on the territory of certain European countries, which is turning West Europeans into nuclear hostages of the Pentagon. Thus, Japan is helping the United States to create a supertense situation in West Europe. So is the Soviet Union supposed to encourage such an international role for Japan?

Things are no better with regard to Japan's broader international role. In the Pacific, the United States regards Japan as its first and most reliable ally in establishing American hegemonism in that region. Japan is a member of an aggressive military bloc: The United States, Japan, and South Korea. Japan has adopted a pledge for the military patrolling of waters for a distance of 1,000 miles from Japanese bases, and so forth. Is the Soviet Union also supposed to encourage and support this international role of Japan — a role that is degrading from the viewpoint of its national interests? If it gives Tokyo pleasure to pull chestnuts from the fire for American imperialism, how after this is it possible to say that it is concerned about Japan's international prestige?

Nor have Japan's ruling circles avoided the temptation to follow their guardians in wailing about an imaginary "Soviet threat." From time to time, Foreign Minister Abe, who is also not adverse to speaking of the need to improve relations with the Soviet Union, is inclined to accuse the Soviet side of superarmament, while Japan, according to him, does not pose any threat to the Soviet Union. Here he borrows American vocabulary in full in his reasoning. And this is said quite unashamedly by the representative of a country which is being turned into an American "unsinkable aircraft carrier" and all of whose combat means are openly directed against the Soviet Union! How can the Soviet Union not take all this into consideration when discussing prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations! But even under conditions which have taken shape, the Soviet Union has repeatedly put peace initiatives to Japan. So the ball is not in our court. It is not hard to imagine how much Japan's international role would be enhanced if it were to switch from words to action in the direction of improving Soviet-Japanese relations, in the direction of easing international tension.

This would undoubtedly accord with the fundamental sentiments of the Japanese public, as evidenced by statements in the Japanese newspapers. It was not for nothing that many of them have paid special attention to the statement of Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, that "the Soviet Union, immutably loyal to the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems, will consistently advocate the peaceful resolution of all international problems and actively cooperate with all states which are prepared to help by practical actions to reduce international tension, to create and strengthen an atmosphere of trust in the world, and to develop mutually advantageous cooperation among states on all continents."

Japan is no exception to this.

U.S. TEAM 'SPIRIT-84', 'RIMPAC' MANEUVERS BLASTED

PM281502 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[Own international observer A. Golts "Military-Political Review": "Militarist Fever: Washington's Hegemonist Plans in Eastern Asia; Sinster Objectives of 'Team Spirit-84' Maneuvers; Tripartite Bloc Being Cobbled Together"]

[Text] Pursuing their adventurist global policy, aggressive U.S. imperialist circles have unleashed large-scale militarist preparations virtually all over the globe. These are conducted particularly intensively next to the Soviet Union's borders. Having sited Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe, Washington, judging from statements by U.S. officials, now intends to "intensify its attention" on the Asia-Pacific region. "The buildup of our economic and political interests in Asia, as well as interests in the sphere of security," asserted L. Eagleburger, a prominent representative of U.S. diplomacy, "will probably entail the creation of new ways of safeguarding these interests more effectively."

U.S. policy in this region already makes it possible to gain a quite definite idea of what "ways" we are talking about. They are primarily attempts to sharply change the regional strategic situation to the U.S.' advantage.

It is to this very end that Washington is conducting preparations to site medium-range nuclear missile weapons in the Asia-Pacific region. It is proposed to implement the first stage of the Pentagon plan this summer, when 375 Tomahawk SLCM's will be installed on ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet. They will supplement the 400 nuclear munitions [boyepripasy] already carried on the fleet's aircraft carriers, as well as the tactical nuclear weapons on Japanese and South Korean territory. The deployment of around 50 nuclear-capable F-16 figher-bombers in Japan will follow. And finally, in the long term, there will be the siting of Pershing II's and long-range GLCM's on Japanese territory and in the south of the Korean peninsula. Thus, Washington also intends to create an additional nuclear threat in Asia the USSR and other socialist countries similar to that being implemented on the European Continent.

Simultaneously, a massive buildup of the Pacific grouping of U.S. troops and naval forces is under way. Militarist preparations unleashed here by the United States over the past 3 years have assumed such dimensions that the Japanese magazine ASIA PACIFIC COMMUNITY assessed them as "a saber-rattling policy." Moreover, the magazine noted that the desire to assert hegemony with the aid of military force is a kind of political disease in Washington.

If we consider the militarist fever gripping the U.S. ruling circles as a "disease," "acuteness" in the Asia-Pacific region can always be determined by observing the annual U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit" maneuvers, the largest maneuvers in Asia in which the U.S. Army takes part. The latest militarist games -- the ninth in the series -- are currently rumbling on in the south of the Korean peninsula. The first exercises took place in 1976, when the United States, having recovered after the shameful defeat in Indochina, again declared its hegemonist aspirations on the Asian Continent. Then the exercises lasted 11 days and involved 46,000 servicemen. Later on, the scale of "Team Spirit" expanded. Naval carrier groups and U.S. strategic aviation started taking part in them.

The "Team Spirit-84" maneuvers currently being held are unprecedented in their scale. Some 207,000 servicemen are taking part in a militarist marathon scheduled to last 2 and 1/2 months.

Apart from the U.S. troops permanently stationed in South Korea, the Pentagon has transferred to that area units of the 3d Marine Division from Okinawa, the 25th Infantry Division from Hawaii, and also troops stationed in the Philippines, Guam, and California. B-52 strategic bombers and ground-attack and fighter aircraft have been sent to the exercise area. A U.S. squadron comprising the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk and other warships is off the coast of the Korean peninsula.

The culmination of the "Team Spirit-84" maneuvers was a 50,000-man Marine landing on 20 March. There was fire support from ships and aircraft. The landing was preceded by a sort of "dress rehearsal" during which U.S. troops and South Korean Army units made a forced crossing of the Han-Gang River.

Representatives of the U.S. Armed Forces command are alleging that the sole aim of the "Team Spirit" maneuvers is to prepare troops and naval forces to repel "aggression from the north." However, the scenario for these excercises, which includes major landing operations, forced crossings of water obstacles, and the seizure of bridgeheads leaves no doubt that their true objective is to prepare for large-scale aggression. And this is no longer a secret from anyone. Thus, the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI, quoting the opinion of Japanese military specialists, stresses that the "Team Spirit-84" maneuvers are an important stage in the practical elaboration of the elements of Washington's and Seoul's "new offensive strategy." The essence of this strategy, the foreign press points out, consists in carrying out a "preventative strike" against the northern part of the Korean peninsula, that is, against the DPRK, using nuclear and chemical weapons.

The provocative nature of "Team Spirit-84" is even more evident when you consider that shortly before the maneuvers started, the DPRK put forward constructive initiatives whose implementation would have made it possible to ease tension on the Korean peninsula and stabilize the situation there. It was proposed to hold tripartite talks between the DRPK, the United States, and South Korea which would focus on replacement of the armistice agreement by a peace agreement and on the withdrawal of U.S. troops. And how did Washington and Seoul respond to this initiative? Under the guise of preparing to "defend South Korea," they initiated a large-scale military provocation near DPRK territory.

For the United States, the "defense of South Korea" is a convenient cover for continuing the U.S. occupation of the south of the peninsula and continuing to turn it into a bridgedhead from which it can threaten the socialist countries.

In the implementation of its sinister plans, Washington relies on the dictatorial Seoul regime. Obedient to the will of its U.S. masters, it makes its own people pay for implementing the gigantic military programs devised for South Korea in the Pentagon. Seoul annually spends around $4 billion on military purposes, which constitutes roughly 40 percent of the state budget. A considerable portion of these resources go to purchase U.S. military hardware. This year alone, the United States intends to deliver to South Korea modern F-16 fighter-bombers, missile systems, antitank devices, and other types of arms. In all, according to the Japanese KYODO agency's figures, the United States will sell Seoul $8 billion worth of arms and military hardware in 1985-1989.

It is no accident that Washington is so diligent in arming its puppet. After all, today the 600,000-strong South Korean Army (the largest of the armies of Asian capitalist countries) is virtually completely subordinate to the U.S. command in the Asia-Pacific region. And the Pentagon, judging by everything, is gambling on it extremely seriously in its strategic planning. In devising the scenarios for aggressive wars in Asia, the U.S. generals of course take into consideration the fact that currently Seoul's Armed Forces have at their disposal 20 infantry divisions, 1 mechanized division, and 3 marine divisions. There it is, the cannon fodder for U.S. military adventures!

It has also long ceased to be a secret that these maneuvers, although they are called U.S.-South Korean, have a third, clandestine participant. I am talking about Japan. And the point is not simply that all the U.S. bases on the Japanese islands are involved in "Team Spirit" and representatives of the "Self-Defense Forces" are attending the maneuvers as "observers." The Pentagon specially plans joint U.S.-Japanese troop exercises so that the most important of them coincide with "Team Spirit," so that not only the south of the Korean peninsula, but the whole of East Asia be gripped by the militarist fever.

"Team Spirit-84" "coincided" with major maneuvers by the U.S. and Japanese navies in the region of the island of Shikoku. Taking part in them were around 300 warplanes which rehearsed operations for destroying "enemy" ships. This is hardly an accidental coincidence. Also hardly accidental is the fact that while the "Team Spirit" maneuvers continue in the south of the Korean Peninsula, Japanese warships together with the navies of the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand will be taking part in the "Rimpac-84" naval exercises, which will take place in the central part of the Pacific.

The patent desire to include Japan and South Korea in a single system of militarist actions in the region is still further evidence of Washington's efforts to cobble together a tripartite alliance between these countries. Clearly, the concluding stage in the creation of this military bloc is now beginning. Ranking military men and diplomats are shuttling between capitals. Recently the first Japanese-South Korean political consultations were held; they discussed, in particular, the "situation in the region." This discussion, according to Japanese press reports, will be continued during the forthcoming visit to Tokyo by the South Korean dictator Chon Tu-hwan.

Without waiting for the formal conclusion of the alliance Washington is doing everything possible to ensure that the alliance is already tested in practice. As observers note, the United States intends to reassign to the Japanese Army certain functions with which the Pacific grouping of the U.S. Armed Forces is presently tasked. It is a question in particular of blockading three Far Eastern straits. There is even talk of deploying Japanese troops on the Korean peninsula "in the event of emergencies." Clearly the implementation of these schemes requires close collaboration between the Armed Forces of Tokyo and Seoul. In creating the military bloc, the United States is also attempting to ensure this collaboration.

The creation of a militarist alliance in the Far East ought in Washington's opinion, to make it easier to site new U.S. nuclear missile weapons in the region. It will be recalled how skillfully the United States manipulated the slogan "Atlantic solidarity" in pressuring the West European allies to make them agree to the "Euromissile" deployment. With the appearance of a new military bloc in Asia the United States is evidently counting on repeating the same operation, but now under the slogan "Pacific solidarity."

The deployment of new nuclear missile weapons on the Asian Continent, the cobbling together of a militarist alliance there, the holding of large-scale military demonstrations like the "Team Spirit" maneuvers -- these are the concrete manifestations of U.S. policy in the Asia-Pacific region. And all these operations serve one dangerous objective -- the attempt to achieve military superiority over the USSR and create an additional threat to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

These attempts are doomed to failure. The Soviet Union will not allow the military equilibrium that has been achieved to be smashed. But the adventurist U.S. actions are leading to a still greater exacerbation of the situation and an intensification of the danger of war in the region.

BABRAK KARMAL ADDRESSES DRA TRIBAL ELDERS

LD281454 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Kabul March 28 TASS -- The aim of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is a further deepening of socio-economic reforms in the interests of the mass of the people, said Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Addressing a meeting with elders of tribes and representatives of the working people from Jowzjan Province, he stressed the need for persistant work among the masses for explaining the aims of the April Revolution.

The Afghan leader spoke highly of the Soviet Union's peaceable foreign policy, the internationalist aid rendered by the USSR to the Afghan people. He strongly condemned the criminal activities of international imperialism wth the USA at the head vis-a-vis independent Afghanistan.

The elders of tribes and representatives of the working people expressed support for the measures of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Revolutionary Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan aimed at improving the living standards of people.

DRA BLASTS IRAN'S 'ANTI-AFGHAN' STANCE

PM280904 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM No 13 in Russian 23-29 Mar 84 p 9

[Reprint of Kabul HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR article: "Tehran's Anti-Afghan Activity"]

[Text] In April 1981, Iran's Foreign Ministry published a plan concerning Afghanistan which envisaged stationing subunits of the Iranian and Pakistani Armed Forces on the DRA's territory under the title of "Islamic Peace-Keeping Forces." The aim of this plan was the occupation of Afghanistan with foreign troops and the creation of a government composed of counterrevolutionary figures who had fled abroad. Its publication was none other than open interference in the DRA's internal affairs.

Tehran, Qom Mashhad, Zahedan, and other Iranian cities were transformed into nests of Afghan counterrevolution, from which -- with the consent and help of the official authorities -- the bandits make attacks on Afghan border settlements. A press conference was held in March 1983 in Tehran, in which ringleaders of the Afghan counterrevolution entrenched on Iranian territory and belonging to the grouping the "National Front of Afghanistan's Islamic Revolution" took part. This press conference, at which not one word of truth about Afghanistan was spoken, was transmitted on Iranian television and radio.

Almost every day the Iranian newspapers publish various kinds of statements, resolutions, and articles by ringleaders of the counterrevolution, presenting them as "genuine fighters" or "fighters for an idea." Yes, back in 1981, the Kuwaiti magazine AL-MAJALIS AL-MUSAWWARAH published facts throwing light on the true face of these fighters. Sheykh Mukammad Mohsen, ringleader of the "Islamic Movement of Afghanistan," was -- before the Iranian revolution -- a zealous supporter of Iran's Shah Reza Pahlavi and had close contacts with the United States. His close friend and accomplice, Nader Aliullah Dad at one time purchased a deputy's seat in the Afghan parliament at a price of 155 million afghanis. He was the representative for various U.S. companies in Afghanistan and engaged in machinations on the black market.

(Khasan Karim), now leader of the organization "Forces of the Islamic Revolution of Afghanistan," was -- before the April Revolution -- president of the Afghan national insurance company and became famous for bribery and the use of official funds for personal enrichment. Now, this "staunch supporter of Islam" maintains close links with the CIA. It is these people that Iran has been harboring.

PAKISTAN SAID TO BACK U.S. SUBVERSION OF DRA

PM281515 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Mar 84 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Subversive Activity Continued"]

[Text] Washington, 24 Mar -- The U.S. Government is not ceasing its attempts to destabilize the situation in the DRA and is stepping up the scale of its direct support for Afghan counterrevolution. To that end, Washington is expanding deliveries of modern weapons to the bandit formations encamped on Pakistan's territory, which carry out raids against DRA territory. The possibility of setting up in Pakistan a special bureau of the subversive Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe stations is being studied. In this connection, Buckley, a former adviser to the State Department who currently heads these centers for conducting "psychological warfare," is being sent to Islamabad.

As observers are noting, this activity by the Washington administration is supported by Pakistani President Ziaul Haq and by other Pakistani leaders. Questions of expanding subversive activity against the DRA from Pakistan's territory and of conducting an undeclared war from there against Afghanistan by the U.S. special services have been the subject of high-level discussions between Washington and Islamabad.

UK ARTICLE ON PAKISTAN COUP PLOT SCORED

LD281120 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 28 Mar 84

[All quotation marks as received]

["SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on THE SUNDAY TIMES' Canard" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS -- "Anger, resentment and indignation -- these rather strong words express only to a degree the emotional reaction of Indian MP's, the entire Indian public opinion to a recent story which appeared in the British SUNDAY TIMES," SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's Sergey Bulantsev writes today.

SUNDAY TIMES reported that in mid-March Pakistani Government officials had announced that they had discovered a plot devised to unseat the military dictator General Ziaul Haq and stage a coup d'etat.

"These are the facts, the rest is fantasy," the author writes. Quoting some Pakistani sources close to interrogations conducted in the gloomy military prison of Attuq, the British paper writes about India's alleged involvement in the plot.

"The Indian ambassador to Pakistan has vehemently denied India's involvement in the affair. SUNDAY TIMES, nonetheless, went ahead with a report from Islamabad alleging the contrary.

This is what caused a natural outcry of indignation in the Indian Parliament.

Deputies from different political parties were unanimous in regarding the report as a gross provocation devised by its authors with a view to complicating Indian-Pakistani relations," the rejoinder says. India, MP's said, was building relations with its neighbors on the principles of respect for their independence, sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs. Precisely such a policy has won the great Asian power and a leader of the Nonaligned Movement enormous prestige in the international arena."

"The fabricated report was short-lived," the author writes. There would have been no need to go any further if the anti-Indian story in the British SUNDAY TIMES were an individual episode in relations between the former colonial power and its former colony. However, insinuations against New Delhi are clearly of a planned character and come as part of a propaganda effort hostile to the Indians." "All indications are that London would like to 'fuel' constantly the conflict situation in that region."

INDONESIAN FOREIGN MINISTER ON COMING USSR VISIT

LD282203 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1228 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Jakarta 28 Mar (TASS correspondent Yu. Sagaydak) -- "Indonesia and the USSR are linked by good relations thanks to the striving of both sides to maintain dialogue. We occupy united or close positions at international forums on such topical questions as the struggle for peace, averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe," Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, Indonesian foreign minister, stated in an interview to a TASS correspondent on the occasion of his forthcoming official visit to the USSR.

Indonesia regards the maintenance of good relations with the USSR as an important aspect of its foreign policy, he stressed. During the coming visit, we would like to acquaint ourselves with the USSR's position on the problems of relations between East and West and the nuclear arms race. The leaders of our country would like to to make use of the visit to report the opinion of Indonesia and other member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) on the problems of Southeast Asia.

The Indonesian foreign minister expressed confidence that his visit to the USSR would promote the development of trade and economic links between the two countries.

BRIEFS

USSR-PRK FRIENDSHIP AGREEMENT -- An agreement on cooperation between the friendship societies of the USSR and Kampuchea for 1984-85 has been signed in Phnom Penh. Days of friendship with the USSR will be held in various towns and provinces of Kampuchea. Many exhibitions will be organized telling of the achievements of the country of the Soviets in communist construction. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2030 GMT 28 Mar 84 LD]

SRV CULTURAL DELEGATION -- A delegation of leading cadres of the SRV Ministry of Culture has come to Moscow to discuss and sign, with their Soviet counterparts, cultural and art cooperation plans. A protocol on cinematographic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam for 1984 was signed this week. The delegation held a working session with the Soviet Ministry of Culture to make preparations for organizing Vietnamese cultural days in the Soviet Union in 1985. [Excerpt] [Moscow in Vietnamese to Vietnam 1000 GMT 22 Mar 84 OW]

U.S.-PORTUGUESE SPACE TRACKING STATION AGREEMENT

LD281322 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Lisbon March 28 TASS -- The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Portugal Jaime Gama and the U.S. Ambassador to Lisbon Allain Holmes have signed an agreement here Tuesday on creating in the continental part of the Portuguese territory of a station for tracking artificial space objects. It will be connected with the U.S. aerospace defense system.

Although representatives of both countries pointed out a "peaceful character" of the station, the U.S. ambassador admitted that the future station would make a substantial contribution to ensuring the security of the West. In exchange for the permission to start the construction of the station, Portugal will receive additional financial aid from the U.S. According to J. Gama, the overall volume of credits, loans and gratuitous aid will reach 1.745 billion dollars in the coming years. It is also planned to set up a major Portuguese-American fund for a "further development of cooperation" in the spheres of science, technology, trade and culture.

U.S. 'Financial Levers'

LD282240 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Lisbon March 28 TASS -- An agreement signed here on the establishment of a spy radar station to track artificial earth satellites is evidence of the further involvement of Portugal in U.S. global war preparations. The tracking station will be built in Alentejo Province in the south of the country and take orders immediately from the North American Air Space Defence Command. The agreement on building that military project of the Pentagon in Portugal was reached during the recent visit of Prime Minister Mario Soares to Washington. Open pressure was brought to bear on him to secure Lisbon's prompt consent to sign the agreement.

Financial levers were brought into play as well: The White House promised the visitor from Lisbon that in exchange for the permission to begin the construction of the first U.S. military facility in mainland Portugal, the country will receive additional financial aid from the United States. Incidentally, Washington willingly extends financial aid to Portugal, pursuing two main goals, namely, to involve that country in the adventuristic course of the Reagan administration and to make it buy large quantities of modern U.S. weapons. Military cooperation between Washington and Lisbon secures for the Pentagon access to such strategically sensitive facilities as the U.S. Air Force Base Lajes on the Azores. Small wonder that the U.S. Congress approved military and economic aid to Portugal to the total sum of 208 million dollars for fiscal 1984-1985.

The progressive press points out that the tying of Portugal to the Pentagon's juggernaut will cause the escalation of military spending and therefore the growth of the burden of taxes, prices, unemployment and inflation. This is what is offered to ordinary Portuguese by the present government's military "cooperation" with the USA.

SPD YOUTH CHAIRMAN ON USSR ARMS TALKS STAND

LD281748 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Bonn March 28 TASS -- "There is great concern in the Soviet Union over the attempts of the FRG Government at belittling the danger of war, which emerged as a result of the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe," said Rudolf Hartung, chairman of the "Young Socialists" organisation of the SPD [Social Democratic Party].

Addressing a press-conference in Bonn today upon his return from a visit to Moscow, he said that the Soviet Union is ready for talks in the field of disarmament. But to this end it is necessary that the deployment of American nuclear weapons, which has got underway, be halted, and the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles already deployed be taken out of the West European countries. It would be an illusion to believe that the Soviet Union will agree to a resumption of talks under the conditions when the United States Administration has started NATO's rearmament, he stressed.

Reversal to the policy of detente shall be the main objective of the FRG's foreign policy, R. Hartung went on to say. The cancelling of the decision on NATO's rearmament and concluding an agreement on mutual non-use of force and maintaining relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty member-states and the NATO member-countries could be the practical steps in that direction, the chairman of "Young Socialists" said.

FRG'S VOGEL INTERVIEW ON ARMS, USSR TIES

LD271350 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 12, 25 Mar 84

[Interview with West German SPD Bundestag leader Hans-Jochen Vogel by Vladimir Markov: "The Main Thing Is To Stop the Arms Race"]

[Text] After completing his visit to Moscow Hans-Jochen Vogel, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] in the Bundestag, gave an interview to our Bonn correspondent Vladimir Markov.

Q: In West Germany and some other Western countries there is a tendency to paint the present international situation in rosy colours. It is described as having "become safer". What is your opinion?

A: Recently positive prerequisites have come forward to make progress on a number of questions, for instance, the ban and elimination of chemical weapons. But, with respect to the crucial issue -- nuclear armaments -- there have been no positive changes. The situation since November 1983 -- by that I mean the deployment of new nuclear missiles by both sides -- does not strengthen security at all. On the contrary, the new round of arms race is sapping it. At the talks in Washington and Moscow I satisfied myself that both world powers have very different stands in this respect.

Q: What is the essence of the "concept of partnership in security" which is currently being worked out by your Party?

A: It is based on the conclusion that with the present level in the development of nuclear armaments and military technology, survival can only be ensured by joint effort and not at the other side's expense. Previously it was believed that one side had a chance of winning the war. Now in a nuclear conflict -- and any armed conflict in Europe would very soon develop into a nuclear one -- there could no longer be a winner. It would amount to a world catastrophe. Therefore the policy regarding security must be geared to fulfilling joint measures directed, for instance, at building up confidence, limiting and reducing armaments, lowering the risk and sanctioned unleashing of a conflict and its uncontrollable escalation.

The buildup of nuclear arsenals cannot reduce the danger of destroying all life on earth.

Q: What do you think should be done first?

A.: The main thing is to stop the reckless nuclear arms race, which is eating up the vast funds and resources that are so necessary for solving a host of urgent problems. West Germany is not a Third World power. It is a member of the North Atlantic alliance. The Federal Government is in a position to contribute towards a decision that would enable talks between both world powers to be resumed, including the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons. There is a need for specific initiatives on all questions, such as, for example, the cessation of nuclear weapon tests, the renunciation of the militarization of outer space, the creation of nuclear-free corridors.

At the Vienna talks it is necessary to give up once and for all the endless discussions about the quantitative data on the armed forces and armaments of each side, and achieve progress. We assess the norms of relations between nuclear powers positively, primarily those between the Soviet Union and the United States, proposed by Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The well-known Soviet-American accords were reached using this as a foundation in 1972. Our party is in favor of agreeing upon and adopting such a code of conduct in international affairs.

There is also a need to develop further the relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union which, thanks to the policy of agreements initiated by Willy Brándt and Leonid Brezhnev, acquired a completely new quality. I remember that during our meeting in the Kremlin Konstantin Chernenko said: "Let us preserve and deepen whatever good we have both achieved regarding the relations between both countries". There are ample opportunities for developing bilateral cooperation in the economy, culture, science and technology.

Q.: What significance do you attach to the ties between the CPSU and the SPD and how do you think they will develop?

A.: Both parties exchange views on current key issues. Many of them were considered during our recent visit to Moscow. Ties are also maintained between the theoretical journals of the SPD and the CPSU. An agreement was reached during our talks in Moscow, which provided for, in particular, the setting up of a joint group to discuss the problem of cutting military spending and using these funds to help the Third World countries. While promoting relations, neither party denies the existence of contradictions and differences between them, but at the same time they are ready to cooperate in the interest of preserving peace and better understanding between our nations.

FRG SUPPORT FOR U.S. POLICIES EXCORIATED

PM291046 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Grigoryants "Letter From Bonn": "In the Thrall of Self-Deception"]

[Text] Luring simplehearted boatmen with her singing, the fabled golden-haired Lorelei doomed them to perish in the depths of the Rhine. Today convoys of boats confidently skirt the cliff on which the crafty temptress sat, hearing only radar signals. That way it is safer. But the art of misleading people and exposing them to misfortune has plainly stood its ground beneath the onslaught of technical progress. It is sufficient to observe how some people on the Rhine manipulate the problems of conducting an East-West dialogue, of curbing the arms race on the continent, and of preserving the detente process.

If you listen to certain West German figures, things are excellent. Chancellor H. Kohl exudes optimism: "I see positive development," "I think something has been set in motion..."

The press close to the government creates the impression that East-West talks are on the point of being resumed on terms laid down by the West and that it is only necessary, as FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE writes, to be "patient and on no account dash to the negotiating table." On what terms is dialogue possible? The newspaper replies: "Military and political parity is not an imperative precondition."

Why hold talks at all? In order to illumine the West's desire for superiority? The ruling coalition's organs write with cynical frankness: "Even Western governments must hold talks. This accords with their countries' internal political need. No politician will be elected if he does not want talks." It could not be put more clearly. A desire for talks is being shown off in order to calm the ordinary citizen, give him illusions, and paralyze his will for vigorous action in the name of preserving peace.

Another newspaper close to the government -- the capital's GENERAL-ANZEIGER -- confirms this conclusion, commenting on the chancellor's recent U.S. trip in the following words: "For the West German chancellor it was a question, above all, of a joint show of American-West German readiness for talks and disarmament. It was necessary to overturn ideas about the U.S. President as someone hostile to detente -- which at the same time would also benefit his German confederate," that is, Kohl himself. The point is, the newspaper continues, that "proof of the West's obvious readiness for talks is needed to calm the missile fears in the FRG."

And so, people on the Rhine are endeavoring to create a semblance of such readiness. There are swarms of soap bubbles of empty promises and illusory hopes. All that can be heard is that the West is "extending its hand to the Soviet Union," that Washington is on the point of putting forward an all-embracing disarmament initiative, and that the Soviet Union will agree to talks despite the continuing deployment of one battery after another of Pershings in the FRG.

One Bonn commentator states with cynical self-confidence that the break in the talks will hardly be protracted and the Soviet Union will be forced to return to Geneva despite the continuing "arms upgrading." A certain category of newspaper tries to calm the reader by belittling the scale of the threat of war posed by the deployment of American missiles in the FRG. The "reassurances" of a SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG commentator are noteworthy: he writes that "'the day after' -- which, in the opinion of many people, has now drawn near -- will take place only in the cinema. The day on which the missiles fly will come neither today nor tomorrow." However, the author, a specialist on military questions, had only to leaf through the Pentagon's "airland battle" plan to realize how shamelessly he is misleading people.

Putting on a brave face in a sorry business, propaganda organs try to find pluses in Bonn's policy where there are nothing but minuses. One leading newspaper dupes its readers by assuring them that, by supporting the NATO "arms upgrading," the chancellor has "made Bonn's security policy predictable." Indeed, the Pershings have dotted the "i's" by exposing the dangerous essence of the FRG's Atlantic course. The newspaper is not mistaken in this. But it is plainly exaggerating about "predictability." The deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles really renders unpredictable the whole situation in which the FRG finds itself for, as Egon Bahr, the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] expert on disarmament issues, pointed out in the weekly DER SPIEGEL, the consequences of such a course of events would be lamentable. "We no longer decide questions of our own existence," Bahr writes. "The Federal Government has entrusted to the head of a foreign state responsibility for the fate of its own people and state."

A "lullaby" melody, which is employed to lull the FRG citizen, was the propaganda leitmotiv of the chancellor's aforementioned trip across the ocean. On the very eve of the trip, official circles reported that Kohl intended to "prompt the United States to launch a disarmament initiative."

The FRG chancellor maintained that high note throughout the visit, assuring the public that results would not be long in coming. However, assurances of good intentions can only be taken seriously if backed up by real actions. And these do not exist. The United States is not even thinking of constructive steps. Was the chancellor's call for talks meant to succeed, though? "Prior to the start of 'arms upgrading,'" the newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU points out, "Bonn could still insist on talks. It did not take that opportunity. And today Kohl can demand and proclaim whatever he likes. This only has the value of a declamation now."

Of course, the incantations had no effect. H. Kohl was still in Washington when the Reagan administration rejected the Warsaw Pact states' new constructive proposals. This shows, the prominent SPD figure H. Ehmke declared, that "although the American Administration gave the chancellor a friendly hearing, it did not attach particular weight to his advice." Immediately after the end of his talks with the chancellor, the President personally proclaimed a program for a further increase in both conventional and nuclear American arms. As we see, the Reagan administration thoroughly spoiled the game started on the Rhine, spoiled it rudely and unceremoniously with regard to its very important ally.

However, could it have been otherwise? Of its own volition Bonn has become so entangled in the snares of the American policy of confrontation that it has deprived itself of the possibility of independent action with regard for its own interests. Meanwhile, according to SPD opposition figures, in the situation which has taken shape Bonn must summon up courage and put forward its own initiatives.

But, by all accounts, Bonn does not even consider this possibility. While paying lip service to disarmament, the FRG is in fact continuing to actively support the obstructionist American stance. Chancellor Kohl continues to believe that only "arms upgrading," as an inalienable means of exerting pressure, makes serious disarmament talks possible. He declared that by consistently implementing NATO's "two-track decision" the West has created a basis for a policy of dialogue and peaceful cooperation with the East. What a turn up for the books! Those who reckon on talking with the USSR in the language of force and who place on the negotiating table as an argument a gun in the form of Pershings and Tomahawks are far, very far removed from realism.

Nevertheless, Bonn is trying to use the language of diktat in rejecting the USSR's proposals. The chancellor called the idea of a moratorium on the deployment of nuclear missiles "politically mistaken." Bonn brushes aside the Warsaw Pact states' new proposal as "not new" and goes no further than its well-known excuse that "they will be studied carefully." At the Stockholm conference West German diplomacy evades large-scale confidence-building measures rejection of the first use of nuclear weapons and mutual commitments by states not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms, or, in other words, not to use force. Finally, Bonn has agreed in principle to implement the program for the modernization of NATO's infrastructure during 1985-1990, which will require the huge sum of DM28 billion. It is merely the size of the FRG's share of this expenditure that is being haggled over. But it is precisely within the framework of this program that expenditure on the deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles is provided for, so that the FRG is not only readily accepting these first-strike weapons on its territory but is also financing their installation.

These are the facts. Statements that sound peace-loving and calls for a "dialogue" are not worth much unless backed by good will and sincere readiness to reinforce words with actions. So, it will hardly be possible to lull anyone today with the Lorelei's mellifluous songs. As regards our country's position, it is most clear and precise. Commenting on the recent trip to the USSR of H.-J. Vogel, chairman of the SDP faction, UNSERE ZEIT writes, Moscow is ready for serious talks if the United States finally removes the obstacles in their path. Moscow's concrete new initiatives show how earnest its desire is. It is up to the West, including Bonn, to reply.

COMPARISON OF KOHL REPORT ON ARMS TALKS TERMS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 March 1984 in its Second Edition on page 5 carries a TASS report entitled: "You Are Wrong, Mr Kohl" which has been compared with the TASS English report published in the 26 March Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page G 4 revealing the following variations:

PRAVDA version omits entire second paragraph.

Paragraph three, line one reads in PRAVDA: ...newspaper, OFFENBUERGER TAGEBLATT, the chancellor again expressed confidence that...(exchanging wording)

Paragraph four, line two read in PRAVDA: ...Mr Kohl is profoundly wrong when believing... (adding "profoundly")

Line four, reads in PRAVDA: ...in Western Europe. (Next paragraph) The Soviet Union.. (omitting passage).

ZAGLADIN MEETS AUSTRIAN CP LEADERS IN VIENNA

LD281504 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the Central Committee International Department, met with Muhri, Chairman of the Communist Party of Austria; Scharf, member of the Central Committee Politburo; and Steiner, member of the Central Committee and head of the Central Committee International Department, in Vienna.

They discussed issues of international development, and exchanged information on the work of both parties. They stressed the joint striving of the Soviet and Austrian Communists toward strengthening peace and returning to the policy of detente, and developing good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Austria -- which answers the interests of international security and provides employment for the working people of Austria. From this point of view the importance of the successful development of relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Austria was noted.

UK HOLDS TACTICAL EXERCISES FOR CRUISE LAUNCHES

LD291223 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 29 Mar 84

[Text] Tactical exercises were held in Britain last night, the second this month, to dislocate [as heard] units for launching U.S. first-strike cruise missiles beyond the boundaries of the American base at Greenham Common. The British police took precautions to keep pickets outside the base off the convoy of missile launchers. The chairman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Joan Ruddock, denounced the exercises as a sinister and cowardly act. The deployment of cruise missiles on British soil, she said, is turning the country into a nuclear hostage of the United States.

BOVIN ANALYZES SOVIET-SWEDISH RELATIONS

PM291308 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Mar 84 Morning Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin article: "A Week in Sweden" -- first paragraph is editorial note]

[Text] At the suggestion of the editorial office of the Swedish newspaper DAGENS NYHETER, this article is being published simultaneously in IZVESTIYA and DAGENS NYHETER.

My week in Sweden was an ordinary business week. Conversations with politicians, diplomats, journalists, and scientists. Interviews for newspapers and television. A lecture and discussion at the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute. A meeting with the collective at the Soviet Embassy. Different people, a different situation, but the topics of conversation were one and the same: the crisis of detente, Sweden's role in international affairs, and the state of and prospects for Soviet-Swedish relations. The last topic was perhaps the main one.

I was often asked what impressions I had gained from my numerous talks and conversations and from what can be read in Swedish newspapers and seen on Swedish TV. At first I replied rather vaguely and uncertainly. The individual components were not as yet forming a complete picture. However, by the end of the week my uncertainty had disappeared. My reply was roughly the following:

Above all, I was amazed at the discrepancy between the official and semi-official declarations on the desire to have good and balanced relations with the Soviet Union founded on mutual trust, and the output of the mass media which sets the Swedish public against the Soviet Union.

Here are a few facts. Soviet drivers carrying out international road haulage trips are in fact, it transpires, tank drivers in disguise. The aim of the masquerade? Mainly to study the areas through which Soviet tank columns will pass as they cross Sweden toward Norway...Nonsense? Absolutely...But it was alleged in all seriousness.

Or another one. Within the Soviet forces, the Swedes are warned by their newspapers and TV, there are special subunits whose personnel speak fluent Swedish, wear Swedish uniforms and, quite clearly, are assigned for a "blitzkrieg" of Sweden...

Soviet submarines, with which, if you believe the newspapers and TV, Sweden's territorial waters are teeming, is a topic that has long persisted on the pages of the Swedish press and on Swedish TV screens. Any facts? There was one. As a result of a breakdown in navigational equipment, Soviet submarine 137 went off course and inadvertently turned up in Swedish territorial waters in October 1981. The USSR Government expressed its regret at the matter. It would have seemed that that was the end of the matter.

But no. According to Swedish sources, "traces" have since then been discovered in Swedish waters of a few dozen more Soviet submarines -- periscopes, some kind of bubbles, suspicious patches in the water, and the imprint of tracks on the bottom. Possibly there were bubbles and patches. But why Soviet necessarily? After all, if I am not mistaken, the Baltic is also open to other states' submarines. Sweden's Prime Miniser O. Palme was extremely cautious in his interviews to the newspaper DAGENS NYHETER. "A responsible political leadership," he said, "must be exceptionally accurate in its statements. I must proceed on the basis that it is impossible to say with confidence that violations took place, and also that we cannot determine the submarine's nationality." L. Ljung, commander in chief of Sweden's Armed Forces, also mentioned this.

However, far from everyone in Sweden limits himself to a demand for exceptional accuracy. Constantly, persistently, and with no little inventiveness Swedes are being given the idea that a mounting "Soviet threat" exists and that the Soviet Union does not respect Sweden's sovereignty and neutral status. And if you explain that the latest "periscope" was nothing more than a piece of drainpipe it embarrasses few people...

Soviet people find all this outrageous. And I was outraged when my Swedish colleagues, maintaining a professional expression on their faces, asked me the corresponding questions. They really did. And they really have been writing and saying these things. And they splutter that, well, it's a sensation, "the Russians are coming!"

Why does this happen? Where are the roots of the hostile campaign which is clearly at variance with the official assurances of a willingness to improve Soviet-Swedish relations? I asked everyone I talked with about this. Including the prime minister. I will attempt to sum up the replies.

First, I was told, the Soviet Union is clearly underestimating the importance of the incident with submarine 137 and is not taking account of the pecularities of the mentality of a small country dealing with a great power. This event "shook Swedes." However, there is doubt about the other cases, is there not? Maybe. But if they are seen against the background of "mounting USSR military activity" in northern Europe and the Baltic the thought that there is no smoke without fire is inevitable. All this calls the USSR's intentions into question and generates a lack of trust in your country.

Second, since ancient times a solid complex of anti-Russian feelings has existed in Sweden and it begins to function each time any complicted situations arise that alarm the public.

Third, I was assured, the government cannot command the mass media, anyone who wants to can speak out. Pressmen are more interested in the problem of circulation than in the problem of truth, hence the dubious sensations.

Fourth, Sweden may have people and political circles (this was mentioned with the utmost caution and with the maximum number of all possible reservations) who do not want an improvement in Soviet-Swedish relations and who are prepared on any grounds to reproach the government for making "concessions to the Russians." And they, these people and circles, make active use of the "first," "second," and "third" points.

In conclusion I was usually told that one should take the journalists' fantasies with a pinch of salt. Our policy is formulated by the prime minister, the foreign minister, and other officials. And it is a policy of good relations with the USSR. If, they added, there are no new submarines. Those were the sort of conversations I had.

Well, there is logic and reason in everything that has been said, although it is by no means all logic and all reason. That is why I want to hone in on certain facts.

Policy is of course formulated by the government. But in the modern world and in a period of growing democratization of political life, including international life, steady, good relations between states require mutual understanding not only at the government level, but at other levels too. Not only leading circles, but the peoples themselves must gradually overcome the discord and distrust that are products of history and learn to understand each other. This is the most solid foundation for stable, good-neighborly relations.

But if this is so, public figures who understand the need for the benefit of the aforesaid relations ought to be interested in molding the appropriate public opinion in their country. As is well known, there are multifarious ways of doing this far removed from "issuing commands." Regrettably, I observed no such interest in Sweden.

Moreover. Wholly official people -- representatives of the Swedish Armed Forces -- serve as the main source of all the sensations about Soviet periscopes and so forth. Unlike the press, the Swedish Army, insofar as I recall, is not "free", and one could at least ask that the gentlemen officers provide clear proof that there really is a fire before spreading the smoke.

Needless to say, I realize that it is impossible not to take account of pressure from the right wing of political life. But taking it into account in no way means toeing the right-wing line. Let us recall Carter. His passion for kowtowing to the neoconservatives cost him dearly. Any analogy is relative. But even so...

I wrote these words and fell to thinking. What if a Swedish journalist appears and says: Look how brazen these "Russians" have become; Bovin teaches us how we should live our lives; there's further evidence for you of the "Soviets" lack of respect for Sweden. And such a journalist probably will appear. After all, they did write about tank drivers as truckers, why not have one more sin on their conscience? No, I do not want to interfere in Swedish affairs. But I am obliged to interfere in Soviet-Swedish affairs. As is any journalist -- Soviet or Swedish -- who wants to strip Soviet-Swedish relations of their layer of suspicion and prejudice.

Let us put the question thus: who gains? Who gains from the stability of Soviet-Swedish relations being constantly put to the test? Who gains from a constant chill between Moscow and Stockholm? I am sure that the most sophisticated political mind in Sweden could not convincingly prove that it is the Soviet Union that gains from all this. But it is quite simple to prove the reverse: Our country's political interests, our economic requirements, and strategic considerations presuppose the maintenance of good friendly relations with Sweden and, correspondingly, respect for its sovereignty and its neutral status.

The growth of overall tension in international affairs and in particular the intensification of NATO's military activity in the north Europe region and the Baltic basin naturally force the Warsaw Pact to be concerned for its security. This increases -- also for understandable reasons -- the probability of undesirable incidents. Undesirable, precisely. And our command is doing everything possible to ensure there are no more of them. All the more so if it is a question of the territorial waters and airspace of nonaligned or neutral countries. I do not want to assert anything definitely, but I have read that different rules operate in NATO...

Now let us pose the problem of Soviet-Swedish relations in a wider context. One of the particularities of modern international relations is the growth of the activity and influence in world politics is the growth of the activity and influence in world politics of medium and small states, especially neutral and nonaligned ones. This stands out at times of crisis and in a period of tension between the two military-political blocs. Being outside the epicenter of the struggle, the aforesaid states have an opportunity to be distinct intermediaries. It is easier for them to find and pin down areas of common interest whose presence makes compromise possible. Such was the case, for instance, in Madrid, where a group of nonaligned and neutral states, of which Sweden was one, made breaking the deadlock significantly easier. I have no doubt that these states will also make a constructive contribution to the work of the Stockholm conference.

The Soviet Union highly assesses and supports Sweden's proposal to create a nuclear-free corridor in Europe. We welcome Sweden's active stance with regard to turning North Europe into a nuclear-free zone. We devoted great attention to the Palme Commission's report, which contains a number of interesting conclusions and proposals.

And so I pose the question once more: Who gains? Who gains from our distrusting each other? I hope I have managed to show that it is not the Soviet Union. Maybe Sweden? I doubt it. So what can be done? People in Moscow think that if the requisite political will is shown all the amassed misunderstandings and the real and imaginary problems can be eliminated to both sides' benefit. People in Stockholm, insofar as I could tell, are still wary, referring to the "pressure of public opinion." Well, as the saying goes, you can't force people to love you. We can wait. But again: Who gains? I apologize to my Soviet readers for an overly frequent repetition of truisms. As for Swedish readers, if they think about the questions I have posed my article will have fulfilled its task.

ATOMIC ENERGY AGREEMENT RATIFIED WITH SYRIA

LD281738 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Damascus March 28 TASS -- Yesterday, March 27, the USSR Ambassador in the Syrian Arab Republic V. Yukhin and head of the treaty and legal department of the Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs M. Rifai exchanged instruments of ratification of the agreement between the Governments of the USSR and Syria on cooperation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, signed in Moscow on February 1, 1983.

U.S. SENATE VOTES ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR ISRAEL

LD281101 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Washington March 28 TASS -- The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee has voted for the granting of 400 million dollars to Israel in additional military-economic aid in the 1985 fiscal year. Thus the sum total of the aid granted to the main client and strategic ally of the USA in the Middle East will top 2.6 billion dollars, one and a half billion of which earmarked solely for building up Israel's military potentials will be granted on a non-repayable basis.

IRAN, IRAQ REPORT CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

LD281037 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Baghdad March 28 TASS -- Yesterday Iraqi Air Force planes attacked two ships south-east of Khark Island in the Persian Gulf. Simultaneously they attacked an Iranian oil-pumping station in Khorramabad area north of Dezful. As an Iraqi military spokesman said, the aircraft which took part in the operation safely returned to base.

Yesterday Iraqi aircraft flew a total of 152 combat missions. They attacked troop concentrations and enemy air defences east of Basra. As a result of the Iranian shelling of the Iraqi cities of Basra and Mandali, there are civilian casualties and damage was inflicted on civilian objectives.

Nicosia March 28 TASS -- According to the Iranian IRNA agency, there were artillery duels along most sections of the front yesterday. In Hajj 'Umran area, the Iranian artillery destroyed a bridge and an Iraqi observation post. Near Panjwin, Iranian troops defeated an enemy grouping. As IRNA said, Iraqi artillery shelled residential blocks in the city of Abadan, killing and injuring several civilians.

GROMYKO WELCOMES ETHIOPIA'S MENGISTU IN MOSCOW

Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 29 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS -- Mengistu Haile Mariam, chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia and of the Commission for Organizing the Party of Working People of Ethiopia, arrived in Moscow today for a working friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government.

At the airport Mengistu Haile Mariam was warmly welcomed by Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, foreign minister of the USSR; Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; Yegor Ligachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and other officials.

U.S. 'PROVOCATIVE STEPS' TO DESTABILIZE REGION

LD281817 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Addis Ababa, 28 Mar (TASS) -- Washington is undertaking provocative steps to destabilize the situation in the Horn of Africa region. According to reports from Mogadishu, the number of the American contingent at U.S. military bases in Somali towns of Berbera and Kismayu, where subdivisions of gendarme "Rapid Deployment Forces" are permanently deployed, has been increased. At the Air Force base in Berbera, the Pentagon has built the longest landing-strip in Africa, which can take all types of heavy aircraft, including "B-52" strategic bombers. In the same region, the U.S. Central Command (Centcom) has carried out military maneuvers with the participation of Somali troops. Two thousand servicemen of the American 31st Sea Landing Formation practiced landing operations and "joint actions with Somali subdivisions in desert conditions."

Their landing onto the coast was carried out with the support of low-flying naval attack aircraft, including AV-8A Harrier jets. U.S. Navy ships, in particular the atomic aircraft carrier Carl Vinson and the aircraft carrier Bellau Wood, hastened to the shores of Somalia. No secret is made in the United States that this is an integral part of the preparation for aggressive actions against those states of the region whose policy, in the opinion of the American Administration is of a "too independent nature" and "contradicts the vital interests of the United States."

The inflow of American offensive weapons into Somalia and the Sudan, costing many tens of millions of dollars, is increasing at a fast pace. Questions of the increased American military presence in Somalia and of "joint actions in the Horn of Africa" were, according to Western press agency reports, at the center of the talks which took place in Mogadishu recently between C. Crocker, assistant U.S. secretary of state on African affairs, and Siad Barre, president of Somalia, as well as during the secret visit to Washington by J. Barre, minister of foreign affairs of Somalia.

Immediately after the holding of these talks, reports permeated the press that the CIA is carrying out feverish recruitment of mercenary-pilots of military aircraft for the Somali Armed Forces in the United States, Britain, and the racist RSA. The participation is thereby in essence planned of Western countries and their allies in the aggressive actions against independent African states.

USSR NAVY SHIPS CONTINUE VISIT TO CUBA

LD281502 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] The friendly visit to Cuba by a group of Soviet Navy ships continues. Reportage by our Cuban correspondent Stanislav Kozlenko:

[Kozlenko] The guard of honor; flying Soviet and Cuban flags; banners reading "Welcome dear Soviet brothers," and "Long live Cuban-Soviet friendship," shining brass of the Cuban Navy band; crews of Soviet seamen lined up in their white parade uniforms on the deck -- all this created an unforgettable, solemn atmosphere of the meeting.

A group of Soviet seamen headed by Vice Admiral Starozhilov paid a visit to Oscar Fernandez Mell, president of the Provincial Assembly of Havana Province and member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba.

After a friendly conversation at which Vice Admiral Aldo Santamaria Cuadrado, vice minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba, was also present, the guests presented the city with a memorable present: a small copy of a lighthouse in Sevastopol Bay.

CUBAN RELATIONS WITH NON-COMMUNIST WORLD VIEWED

LD282217 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 28 Mar 84

[From "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] ADN has reported that a British parliamentary delegation is in Havana and that Cuban-British trade talks are underway. My colleague Vitaliy Sobolev comments on this report:

[Sobolev] The telegram from Havana refers to an event that at first glance seems fairly routine. The exchange of parliamentary delegations and trade talks are, generally speaking, routine events in international relations. But when the report refers to Britain, the United States' closest ally, and Cuba, one wants to look at this event more closely. It is well known that the current U.S. Administration has escalated the anti-Cuban campaign to the limit. At his meeting with constituents, Comrade Chernenko noted that the United States is subjecting socialist Cuba to an economic blockade and military threats. Washington's leaders do not want anybody to have diplomatic relations with their southern neighbor or to trade with it. In all cases, U.S. diplomacy is doing all it can to ensure that the blockade proclaimed by the United States is supported at least by the NATO allies and the countries of Latin America. But almost all the Latin American states have official ties with the Isle of Freedom. Yet another agreement was concluded between Cuba and Argentina a few days ago. It envisages the expansion of commercial, economic, and scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries.

In general, one has to say that the world prestige of socialist Cuba is immeasurably greater than its prestige during the rule of the dictator Batista. Over 120 countries now have diplomatic relations with Cuba, compared with less than 50 before the revolution. Do not forget that Cuba was the leader of the Nonaligned Movement and still plays a prominent role in it.

Close and friendly ties with the fraternal states are, of course, the most important thing for the Cubans. But their relations with the non-communist world are not bad either. In the mid-70's, the non-communist world accounted for 40 percent of the country's foreign trade turnover. Cuba has been trading for a long time with Japan and the West European countries, in particular with Britain, which I mentioned earlier. These mutually advantageous ties make many U.S. businessmen envious.

One U.S. businessman who is cited by the magazine NATION put it this way: I felt furious after flying to Cuba when I saw French tractors, Japanese computers, and Italian cars there. We could sell Cuba a vast amount of machinery.

I might add that they could purchase a lot of things from Cuba. At the end of the seventies over 300 representatives of U.S. firms visited the Isle of Freedom. Very tempting prospects for business contacts opened up before them. But the Reagan administration decided otherwise. However, it could only influence its own companies -- and not all of them. NATION considers that some of them are concluding deals that have not been sanctioned by the U.S. Government, some of which are on quite a large scale.

The rest of world, with a few very insignificant exceptions, does not share Washington's insane wish to isolate the first socialist country in the Western Hemisphere. The meetings and talks that the British guests have held in Havana are a very typical and persuasive example of this.

TASS NOTES NICARAGUAN PROTEST ON MINE INCIDENT

LD290447 Moscow TASS in English 0438 GMT 29 Mar 84

[Text] Managua March 29 TASS -- Another crime has been committed through the fault of the American Administration which has issued an order to mine Nicaraguan ports. The Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry announced here that the Liberian ship Inderchaser hit a mine, planted by the C.I.A.'s mercenaries, as it was leaving the Nicaraguan port of Corinto. This is already the 4th foreign vessel damaged as a result of U.S. criminal attempts to encircle Nicaragua with a naval blockade. In a statement here the Nicaraguan Government held the Reagan administration fully responsible for the consequences of the act of sabotage against the Liberian ship.

MOSCOW VIEWS U.S. ROLE IN EL SALVADOR ELECTIONS

LD281449 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 28 Mar 84

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Sobolev]

[Text] U.S. policy in Central America arouses acute criticism from the world public. Vote counting in the presidential elections on Sunday is still going on in El Salvador, but President Reagan is already proclaiming victory in the elections -- the victory, as he expressed it, of freedom over tyranny. Of course, the President is not heralding the victory of the patriots over the bloody pro-American regime. He has his own ideas of tyranny and freedom. He has first-hand information on the state of affairs in El Salvador.

The Americans organized the elections, allocated $10.5 million for them, and the vote counting is being carried out using U.S. equipment operated by Americans. Furthermore, 30 special observers plus military advisors and the U.S. Embassy are monitoring the counting on the ground. Monitoring started with the voting itself. The El Salvador soldiers do not have the right to vote, but they were mobilized -- several tens of thousands with tanks and fighter helicopters, to impose order in this excuse for a democratic process. But the U.S. observers had their own U.S. soldiers in reserve on Honduran territory, where they have been holding the "Kilo Punch" maneuvers. These G.I.'s did not take off their parachutes so that they would be ready to also make their contribution to democracy in El Salvador. However, they managed without them.

The famous U.S. efficiency and technology had a special application this time. In certain places there were hundreds of thousands of leaflets, while there were not enough in other places. The voting farce was played out in an atmosphere of chaos, making it possible to obtain any result needed at the elections.

For the time being, according to preliminary calculations, Christian Democrat candidate Duarte has a substantial lead. This is evidently what Washington decided. In the final analysis, Duarte has proved his devotion to the U.S. patrons in the bloody 1980-82 period, when he was considered head of the Salvadoran junta.

But now, since certain differences have arisen for President Reagan with Congress about how many tens of millions of dollars are necessary to get rid of the Salvadoran henchmen, the White House prefers Duarte. He appears more decent than the other favorite, the open murderer D'Aubuisson, and should be more pleasing to congressmen who commit the sin of liberalism.

However, the counting is not yet finished and the voting machine -- a machine in both the literal and the metaphorical sense -- is under U.S. control. We will soon find out exactly what choice Washington has made. But in any case, the pseudo-election performance has been exposed sufficiently, and not only in the progressive U.S. press and that of other capitalist countries.

This attempt by the United States to liberalize the Salvadoran henchmen is threatening to involve and complicate the Central American conflict even more. And it is fraught with danger not only for the peoples of that region of the world, but also with complicating the entire international situation. The terrorist action, as a result of which the Soviet tanker Lugansk suffered, is further confirmation of this. Even THE NEW YORK TIMES, in an article by its observer Wicker, found it necessary to point out that Washington is responsible for the mining of Nicaraguan waters, and that this constitutes an act of international terrorism.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED

PM281036 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR (Otdel Pervyy) in Russian No 6 1984, carries on pages 92-94 five USSR Council of Ministers decrees signed by N. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the following effect: I.M. Kuznetsov be appointed deputy minister of construction, road and municipal machine building (25 Nov 83); V.A. Sayushev be relieved of his duties as first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education in connection with his transfer to other work (25 Nov 83); M.P. Alekseyev by appointed deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in the Atomic Power Industry and relieved of his duties as deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision (29 Nov 83); A.F. Kamenev be appointed deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology (9 Dec 83); and V.M. Velichko be relieved of his duties as first deputy minister of power machine building in connection with his transfer to other work (8 Dec 83).

ANTONOV AT OPENING OF MACHINE TOOL EXHIBITION

PM290956 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 84 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Review of the World's Machine Tool Building"]

[Text] Everything of the best worldwide that today's metal working industry has at its disposal can be seen in Moscow. The "Metal Working 1984 International Exhibition" opened here 27 March. It has been organized with the cooperation of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry. A scientific and technical symposium will be held in the context of the exhibition and the exhibition's commercial center has begun functioning simultaneously with the exhibition.

The exhibition's opening ceremony was attended by A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

GAZLI EARTHQUAKE AFTERMATH, RECOVERY REPORTED

Youth Paper Describes Scene

PM261237 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 24 March 1984 on its front page carries a 200-word article entitled "In Defiance of the Elements" by special correspondents M. Alimov, A. Murtazayev, and M. Serdyukov. The article is carried under the rubric "Stop-Press Photoreportage!" and contains four photographs referred to in the text.

The picture at the top of the page shows a convoy of trucks, the first of which has a trailer whose contents cannot be determined. The remaining four vehicles visible are towing trailers carrying what seem to be portable cabins.

The next picture shows a half-dozen people grouped around a table examining a map or plan. On the wall behind the group is a slogan which reads: "The spirit of the people of Gazli is stronger than the elements."

The next photograph shows a road lined with tents on one side, with items of furniture standing on the pavement. Apparently undamaged apartment blocks are visible in the background.

The final and largest photograph shows an open area with some low flat-roofed buildings in the background against an open sky. A group of children can be seen playing in the open area with one child in the foreground, leaning against a bicycle and smiling at the camera. Between the children and the buildings, a number of tents are visible. The photographs are credited to the authors themselves, whose text is prefaced by a one-paragraph editorial introduction as follows:

"These pictures reached the editorial office by aircraft from Bukhara yesterday. They show the everyday life of Gazli, the young city of gas extraction workers in the Kyzylkum Desert, which was the epicenter of an earthquake a few days ago.

"After the elements had struck, the city's water and electricity supply and telegraph and telephone system were put out of operation. The bakery was put out of action. Water and bread are already available again. Communications are also being reestablished. Day and night powerful trucks arrive in Gazli. They bring produce, tents, timber, metal construction materials, cement, and tiles...Meals are being cooked in Gazli in 48 mobile kitchens. Comfortable portable housing is being brought in from Turkmenistan and tents are arriving from Kazakhstan.

"Some 20 Komsomol operational detachments have been set up at the headquarters for eliminating the after-effects of the earthquake. You can see one of them in the photograph. Komsomol member Abdul-Alim Batyrkhanov, a history teacher and commander of the city's disaster relief headquarters, is shown with his comrades clarifying the plan of immediate measures.

"One of the main symbols of Gazli today is its tent cities. Some are already inhabited, others are only just being set up. Schoolchildren are taking a very active part in this matter. In a few days, school classes will resume. In the meantime, they like to spend their leisure time playing soccer."

Eyewitness Report

PM270854 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Mar 84 p 4

[A. Kazakhov report under the rubric "We Report Details": "The Courage of Tsvetushchiy Settlement"]

[Excerpts] Tsvetushchiy Settlement -- The center of the S.M. Budennyy Horse and Camel Raising Sovkhoz was one of the hardest hit places during the earthquake in Bukhara Oblast. Our special correspondent A. Kazakhov reports from this population center.

Many of the settlement's inhabitants suffered injuries. I saw the settlement's one-room hostel where a heavy rock had smashed a bed in half. Fortunately, the person who was sleeping there escaped with a badly bruised leg. I saw the desks in the local school crushed under a heap of stones.

"A few hours after the earthquake," K. Rakhmatov, deputy chairman of the Bukhara Oblispolkom, recounts, "the first vehicle carrying doctors arrived at Tsvetushchiy, the victims' wounds were dressed, and their broken limbs were put in splints. Immediately after the medical vehicle, a vehicle arrived with food. People began to prepare their breakfast on makeshift stoves."

Shepherd's huts and tents were delivered to the settlement on the same day. Now, as I write these lines, a truck with Kazakh yurt dwellings is being dispatched to Tsvetushchiy -- the people who have been made homeless will get temporary roofs over their heads.

Assistance to the afflicted settlement is part of a great program of all-around support for the Bukhara Oblast rayons hit by the earthquake. The program is being drawn up at the oblast headquarters for eliminating the consequences of the natural disaster. The headquarters is headed by B. Kasymkhodzhayev, secretary of the Bukhara Uzbek Communist Party Obkom.

The Bukhara Uzbek Obkom and its first secretary, Ismail Dzhabbarovich Dzhabbarov, are carrying out a vast amount of work to coordinate the efforts of the oblast organizations, which have begun restoration work, to reveal additional resources for eliminating the consequences of the natural disaster, to provide prompt medical assistance to the population, and to organize the work of enterprises.

The wounds inflicted on the oblast's cities and settlements are gradually beginning to heal.

AUCCTU CONFERENCE DEBATES WORK SHORTCOMINGS

PM281523 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Mar 84 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Conference at AUCCTU"]

[Text] A conference of trade union central committee and council chairmen, heads of AUCCTU sections, and leaders of organizations under the AUCCTU's jurisdiction held at the AUCCTU has discussed ways of further improving the trade union organs' style and methods of work in the light of the demands contained in the CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On the Work of the Central Committee of the Heavy Machine Building Workers' Union."

AUCCTU Secretary V.P. Provotorov delivered a report.

The conference noted that the activity of trade union committees is marked by greater efficiency, better organization, and higher consistency, and a striving for actual work with people in labor collectives is more clearly visible.

This is promoted to a considerable degree by the program of measures approved by the AUCCTU Presidium to further improve the trade union organs' style of work and to strengthen the organizational activity of the AUCCTU apparatus and of trade union councils and committees in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the 17th USSR Trade Union Congress.

At the same time, it was emphasized that a radical improvement has so far failed to materialize in the work style of many trade union organs. The shortcomings in the organizational activity of trade unions which were noted in the party Central Committee resolution are being eliminated only slowly, and trade union organs' tendency to stick to methods that have failed to prove their worth is being overcome with difficulty. Proposals and recommendations were made which will contribute to the elimination of the noted shortcomings, to the greater fruitfulness of organizational and mass work, and to the establishment of an efficient, creative style in all components of trade union leadership.

EXAMINATION OF NEW BRIGADE METHOD OF WORK

OW281323 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0815 GMT on 17 March carries its weekly 30-minute "Political Observer's Talk" program in which political observer L.A. Voznesenskiy interviews A.A. Tarasov, general director of the Moscow "V.V. Kuybyshev Elektrozavod" production association, one of the enterprises engaged in the new economic experiment.

As video intersperses shots of Voznesenskiy and Tarasov speaking in an office with shots of various production processes at the Elektrozavod plant, Tarasov outlines successes in plan fulfillment achieved in the first 2 months of 1984 under the experiment. He says that the association achieved 100-percent plan fulfillment in deliveries according to agreements "for the first time in my memory," and increased labor productivity 11 percent over the same period of last year. He adds that the output of consumer goods increased 13 percent and profits rose by 20 percent over the same period of last year.

Tarasov continues in general terms to outline steps in evaluating and implementing the conditions of the experiment in his association and the importance of introducing the brigade method of labor organization. As he speaks, video shows a crowded production line on which women can be seen manually assembling irons. Tarasov outlines the material incentive program, under which R200,000 is added to the material incentive fund for distribution to the workers each time the delivery plan is fulfilled by 100 percent. R200,000 is equivalent to 15 percent of the basic incentive fund.

Interviews with workers operating a coil-winding machine and assembling other generator components, mostly women in a crowded workshop, follow. They comment on the formation of brigades at the plant and the ensuing benefits.

Tarasov notes the improved performance of supply enterprises and the Moscow railroad, which although not engaged in the experiment, have improved supplies and services to his plant. However, he laments the inability of the railways to move very heavy equipment and the lack of precise orders from clients that would permit future planning. He supports the idea of direct agreements with customer enterprises, adding this would prevent cancelled orders that create overproduction. He also supports the idea of concluding these agreements 180 days prior to the beginning of a plan quarter.

Tarasov notes that he is accountable to the rayon party and soviet committees for economic performance, while planning is carried out by the ministry and the All-Union Soyuztransformator industrial association, to whom he is also accountable.

In concluding the program, Tarasov reiterates that the major benefit of the economic experiment so far is the increase in worker incentive, to which Voznesenskiy adds that the entire collective can see the benefits of operating under the conditions of the economic experiment.

27 MAR AGRO-INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

PM281501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 84 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Along the Path of Intensive Development"]

[Text] The All-Union Economic Conference on Agro-industrial Complex Probelms continued it work in Moscow 27 March. Those assembled welcomed Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Dolgikh, M.V. Zimyanin, I.V. Kapitonov, Ye.K. Ligachev, and N.I. Ryzhkov with prolonged applause.

The conference participants discussed in detail the current tasks of party, soviet, and economic organs to raise the economic efficiency of agriculture and other agro-industrial complex sectors. They noted the importance of the propositions and conclusions contained in the conference speech by K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the report by M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The conference was addressed by: V.K. Gusev, first secretary of Saratov Obkom; I.A. Mozgovoy, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; B. Nurtazin, director of Turgay Oblast's Ishimskiy Sovkhoz; Yu. M. Khusainov, first deputy chairman of the Commission for Agro-industrial Complex Questions; A.S. Subbotin, chairman of Bryansk Oblast's Pochepskiy Rayon Agro-industrial Association Council; A.K. Karimov, first secretary of Surkhan-Darya Obkom; V.S Murkhovskiy, first secretary of Stavropol Kraykom; G.D. Mgeladze, chairman of the Georgian SSR State Committee for Agricultural Production; A.I. Gurina, link leader on Kalinin Oblast's Torzhokskiy Rayon Mir Kolkhoz; K. Begaliyev, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Kantskiy Rayon's Alga Kolkhoz; L.V. Smirnov, first secretary of Moscow Oblast's Ramenskoye Gorkom; A.F. Veprev, director of Krasnoyarsk Kray's Nazarovskiy Sovkhoz; Z.D. Kobzar, chief economist at Nikolayev Oblast's Novoodesskiy Rayon Put k Kommunizmu Kolkhoz; A.A. Salnyn, chief of the Agrarian Problems Department at the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute; B.M. Isayev, first deputy chairman of the Tatar ASSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Agro-industrial Association Council; A.I. Zuyev, chairman of Kokchetav Oblast's Shchuchinskiy Rayon Selkhoztekhnika association; Academician A.A. Nikonov, first vice president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences; A.F. Ponomarev, first secretary of Belgorod Obkom; D.K. Motornyy, chairman of Kherson Oblast's Belozerskiy Rayon Kirov Kolkhoz; S.I. Manyakin, first secretary of Omsk Obkom; A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; V.P. Nikonov, RSFSR minister of agriculture; A.I. Romanov, chairman of Bashkir ASSR Ilichevskiy Rayon Agro-industrial Association Council; L.G. Kletskov, first secretary of Grodno Obkom; G.I. Kozhanov, director of the Novosibirsk Oblast Karashuk Dairy Canning Combine; M.G. Motoriko, Kazakh SSR minister of agriculture, and V.F. Reznikov, chairman of Krasnodar Kray's Kanevskiy Rayon Pobeda Kolkhoz.

The speakers emphasized that the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum and the Food Program which it adopted marked the beginning of a qualitatively new stage in the party's agrarian policy, provided a powerful boost to the consolidation of the country's agro-industrial potential, and have led to remarkable advances in land cultivation and livestock raising. They cited specific facts to show the favorable impact on production of the new methods of management in the agrarian sector and the improvement of its economic mechanism. The economic indicators of farms have improved and social transformations in the countryside have been accelerated.

Analyzing the progress in the Food Program's implementation and the fulfillment of the 5-year plan targets, the speakers focused their attention on unresolved tasks and the ways to eliminate shortcomings. In order to obtain higher yields from the existing vast potential of the agro-industrial complex it is necessary to introduce sceintifically substantiated systems of land cultivation more actively, further develop agricultural machine building, and raise the standard of economic management. The proper concern for the main means of production -- the land -- is not shown everywhere. Insufficiently full use is made of the potential of irrigated and reclaimed lands.

There was detailed examination of questions linked with the restructuring of the management of agriculture and the other agro-industrial complex sectors, the improvement of the relations between the partners, and the surmounting of the persisting departmental barriers. The speakers noted that the paramount concern of rayon agro-industrial associations must be to pool their efforts and focus their attention on resolving the fundamental problems. The speakers cited convincing examples of successful activity by the new full-fledged organs of state management.

The conference provided an opportunity for a broad exchange of views on the ways to improve planning, increase labor productivity, and consolidate financial autonomy. It generalized the experience of the organization and work of collectives under the nonregulated system, which is based on the end results of labor -- the harvest or the output of livestock products.

The speakers stressed the need to concentrate efforts on the spring field work and on widespread socialist competition between agro-industrial complex workers so as to successfully fulfill the current year's plans and pledges.

There was comprehensive discussion of the paramount tasks facing the party, soviet, and economic organs. The speakers welcomed with satisfaction the party Central Committee's directive for the more precise demarcation of the functions of these organs. Examples were cited wherein raykoms still substitute for agro-industrial associations, while rayon agro-industrial association councils copy the "desk-bound" style of work of the former rayispolkom agriculture administrations. Complete support was expressed for the principles of leadership, which were described in the report as rigorous and determined.

Being the political nucleus of agro-industrial complex labor collectives, the primary party organizations are called upon to continue their active organizational and political work aimed at enhancing each working person's responsibility for the job entrusted to him.

The speakers were unanimous in their appraisal of the mainline trend in the further development of the agro-industrial complex -- the comprehensive intensification of its sectors and the greater economic efficiency of the potential created and the resources being allocated.

The conference participants enthusiastically adopted a letter to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade K.U. Chernenko, assuring them that they will successfully accomplish the tasks set for the workers of the agro-industrial complex.

TASS PROVIDES DATA ON USSR 'FOOD PROBLEM'

LD281632 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 28 Mar 84

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS -- Speaking at the all-union economic meeting on the problems of the agrarian-industrial complex, which sat in session for two days in the Kremlin, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Chernenko stressed that the party "regards the concern for the development of agriculture not only as an economic, but also as a priority socio-political task". This approach to the food problem stems from the provisions of the general line of the party which considers as its main task the maximum satisfaction of the vital requirements of the Soviet Union. Proceeding from this, the rates of growth of the food production at all the stages of peaceful development of the USSR have invariably outpaced the rates of population growth.

At present the Soviet Union, whose population accounts for 6 percent of the whole of mankind, accounts for 13 percent of the world's production of grain, 10 percent of the world's production of meat, 20 percent of milk, and 12 percent of eggs.

The growth of the food production became especially noticeable in the past 15-20 years. In the period between 1965 and 1980 the country's population increased 15 percent, while the growth agricultural output -- by 50 percent. This permitted an appreciable improvement in the structure of the diet of the Soviet people. Over these years the consumption of meat grew by more than 40 percent, milk by 25 percent, fish by 40 percent, sugar by 30 percent, and vegetables by 35 percent.

It will be noted that this growth was achieved in the conditions of a decreasing rural population. While 20 years ago one peasant in the USSR was assumed "to provide food" for six people, today there are already ten consumers of agricultrual produce per one farmer, livestock breeder or agricultural mechanic.

Bourgeois propaganda is trying to back up its inventions alleging a "crisis condition" of Soviet agriculture by making references to the effect that Russia used to export grain before the 1917 Revolution, while now it imports grain and other food products. In fact, between 1909 and 1913 Russia used to export an average 11 million tonnes of grain a year. But bread was exported by big land owners and intermediaries, while 20 million peasants went hungry, and every fifth inhabitant of the country was undernourished.

At present, according to data of FAO (the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations), the average per capita consumption of food products in the USSR corresponds to the physiological standard and the level of the most developed countries.

The food problem in the USSR today lies not in the need to provide people with food products in general (the total quantity of calories, according to FAO data, is sufficient), but rather to improve the diet structure. There has been a sharp increase and continuous growth in the demand for the most valuable products -- meat, milk, vegetables, and fruits. And it is these so far that are really in insufficient supply. This is partly atttributable to the fact that over the past 15 years the Soviet people's real incomes have doubled, while the retailed prices of staple food products have practically remained unchanged.

To rectify the situation, the USSR food programme was developed and approved in 1982. Its principal objective is to ensure, in the briefest possible period of time, the country's reliable supply with the most valuable food products. The programme's major assignments aim at developing livestock breeding and expanding the production of vegetables and fruits.

The performance of 1983 indicates that these assignments of the food programme are beginning to be implemented. Last year the production of meat reached 16 million tonnes, and of milk -- 96.4 million tonnes. This is 600 thousand tonnes and 5.4 million tonnes more, respectively, than was produced in 1982. It was stated at the economic meeting on the problems of the Agrarian-Industrial complex that in the past year, for the first time in many years, all the assignments in the output of livestock products were fulfilled or overfulfilled.

USSR-INDIA JOINT LAUNCH TO BEGIN 3 APR

LD282055 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Mar 84

[From the Vremya newscast; A. Vorobyev video report from India]

[Excerpts] Today the names Zvezdnyy Gorodok, Baykonur, the names of the Soviet and Indian members of the crews, are constantly on the pages of the central newspapers. The place where one can see the latest photographs and perhaps the most interesting ones are at the display of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY in Delhi, which is permanently surrounded by crowds of inhabitants of the capital and visitors.

During the period of preparations and the flight itself, there are plans to carry out a broad campaign in India that will allow the people to acquaint themselves with the aims and tasks of space research. To explain space research's role in the development of the country's economy as dreamed about by Jawaharlal Nehru, great son of the Indian people, when he received the world's first cosmonaut, Yuriy Gagarin.

The launch of the Soyuz T-11 spaceship with the Soviet-Indian crew on board is planned for 3 April. The spaceship will be launched from the Baykonur cosmodrome at 1708 Moscow Time [1408 GMT].

BRIEFS

TURKMEN WATER RESOURCES -- Scientists in Turkmenistan have drawn up a map depicting the underground water resources in the Karakum Desert. In the course of their work, they used data from the Soviet space station. A huge water resource was determined to be close to the historic [word indistinct] of Amu Darya. The information compiled on the underground water resources will make the construction of irrigation installations in dry regions of Turkmenistan possible in the future. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 20 Mar 84 GF]